

MAY 12 1944

VOL. LXV, 2

MINNICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

WHOLE No. 258

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, RICHARD M. HAYWOOD

KEMP MALONE, HENRY T. ROWELL

Honorary Editor

DAVID MOORE ROBINSON

APRIL, 1944

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Suetonius in the Civil Service under Hadrian. By HENRY A. SANDERS, - - - - -	113
Italic and Celtic. By MYLES DILLON, - - - - -	124
Lucretius and the Sixth Book of the <i>Aeneid</i> . By AGNES KIRSOPP MICHELS, - - - - -	135
The Method of Choosing Archons in Athens under the Empire. By JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS, - - - - -	149
Cicero's Greek Text of Herodotus, I, 31. By WARREN E. BLAKE, - - - - -	167
Latin <i>Uxor</i> . By FRITZ MEZGER, - - - - -	170
Notes on Greek Poetry. By RICHMOND LATTIMORE, - - - - -	172
Did Menander Nod? <i>Epitrepontes</i> 53. By EDWARD CAPPS, - - - - -	175
Tacitus' <i>Annals</i> , IV, 12. By C. ARTHUR LYNCH, - - - - -	179
REVIEWS: - - - - -	181
<i>Finley's Thucydides</i> (MALCOLM F. MCGREGOR).— <i>Johnson and Goodrich's Papyri</i> in the Princeton University Collections, Volume III (†CLINTON W. KEYES).— <i>Dinsmoor's Observations on the Hephaisteion</i> (HOMER A. THOMPSON).— <i>Persson's The Religion of Greece in Prehistoric Times</i> (ERNST RIESS).— <i>Howe's The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian</i> (A. D. 180-305) (O. W. REINMUTH).— <i>Rose's The Eclogues of Vergil</i> (E. L. HIGHBARGER).— <i>Tait's Philodemus' Influence on the Latin Poets</i> (RICHARD M. HAYWOOD).— <i>Warmington's Remains of Old Latin</i> , Vol. III: Lucilius; The Twelve Tables (E. BOUCHER STEVENS).	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	208

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 25 cents extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Benjamin D. Meritt; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore 18, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1916.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXV, 2

WHOLE No. 258

SUETONIUS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE UNDER HADRIAN.

A very incomplete and unsatisfactory picture of the life of Suetonius is given in the histories of Roman literature and little has been added to the picture since Macé, *Essai sur Suétone* (Paris, 1900). The known facts obtained from his own writings and the letters of Pliny are only the following: His father was tribune of the thirteenth legion Gemina in April 69 at Bedriacum (*Otho*, 10). Twenty years after the death of Nero he calls himself an *adulescens* (*Nero*, 57), but when Domitian, impoverished by wars and extravagant building, began to extend his cruelty and extortions to the common people and the Jews (about 88?) Suetonius calls himself an *adulescentulus* (*Domitian*, 12), evidently using the word as equivalent to *adulescens* above.¹ About 96 Pliny (*Ep.*, I, 18) promises to try to secure postponement of a lawsuit in which Suetonius (*advocatus*) is to plead.

In the same year Pliny (*Ep.*, I, 24) calls him *contubernalis* and *scholasticus*, while assisting him to buy an estate near the city. Some five years later (*Ep.*, III, 8) he reports that the military tribuneship which he had obtained for Suetonius from Neratius Marcellus (governor of Britain, 101-103) has been transferred at his request to a relative.

About 105 A. D. (*Ep.*, V, 10) he asked Suetonius to publish his already completed work, and about 108 (*Ep.*, IX, 34) he asks advice about a public reading of his (Pliny's) poems by a freedman. Between 111 and 113 A. D. (*Ep.*, X, 94, 95) he asked and obtained the *ius trium liberorum* for Suetonius and finally

¹ Macé, pp. 45 f., distinguishes between these periods of youth.

according to Spartianus² Suetonius lost his position *ab epistulis Latinis* in 121 A. D. at the same time that the praetorian prefect, C. Septicius Clarus, was dropped from office. To him, according to Lydus,³ Suetonius dedicated the *Lives of the Caesars*, published therefore not later than 121 A. D. It may be assumed also from the extent of Suetonius' writings that he was not disgraced by his discharge but continued to write and publish for many years.

Macé in the work cited above added much to this outline. From the list of writers treated by Suetonius in the *De viris illustribus* he fixed the date of that work after 105 (death of Julius Tiro) and before 114 (death of Pliny). This is probably the already completed work which Pliny⁴ urged Suetonius to publish about 105 A. D.

We must also be grateful for Macé's thorough study of the sources of Suetonius, by which he shows wide use of the libraries and unpublished archives of the city.

Less sound is his long treatment of the date of Suetonius' birth, which he places in 68 or 69 against Mommsen's⁵ date of 77 assumed from the request for a tribuneship in 101. In all probability both are wrong, Mommsen because he did not put sufficient weight on the circumstance that already in 96 A. D. Suetonius was pleading as an advocate, and Macé, because the father, Suetonius Laetus, as a soldier active with his legion until April 69, would probably not have had a wife with him, especially in a province like Pannonia.

Suetonius Laetus, as a military tribune *angusticlavius*, was a regular line officer and he had reached this position through one or more subordinate offices, all of which implied actual service in a Roman camp. A comparison of about a hundred men of equestrian rank, whose careers are adequately recorded,⁶ shows that nine started as *primipilus*, twenty-seven as *praefectus cohortis* to which the three cases of *tribunus cohortis* may be added, eleven as *praefectus fabrum*, and four as *centurio* immediately followed by the *primipilate*. With these we should

² *S. H. A., Hadrian*, 11, 3.

³ *De magistratibus*, II, 6.

⁴ *Ep.*, V, 10.

⁵ *Hermes*, III (1868), p. 43.

⁶ Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, I, 293 ff.

join the six cases stating that all of the preliminary military commands of equestrian rank had been held and perhaps some of the six cases where *equo publico* or some similar designation precedes a civil career. Against this array only nine cases are found which list the military tribuneship in a legion as the first military office in the *cursus honorum*, and of these officers one held the military tribuneship four times and another twice.⁷ We may reasonably assume that Suetonius Laetus, a young man of equestrian rank, entered the military service at an age between 18 and 22 and that he was a military tribune in the thirteenth legion at Bedriacum as his second or third command. This legion had been stationed in Pannonia and with other Dalmatian and Pannonian troops was brought into Italy to join the Othonian army which came north from Rome.⁸ The military apprenticeship of Suetonius Laetus was served in the northern provinces, probably entirely in Pannonia. He is not likely to have been in Rome from 66 to 68 A. D. Furthermore he probably did not leave the army immediately after the defeat since the commanding officer of the legion, Vedius Aquila, was retained. Whether he returned to Pannonia with the legion after building the amphitheatres at Cremona and Bononia, we cannot know, but it seems most unlikely that Suetonius would have failed to mention his father again had he been present with the thirteenth legion when it in turn joined in the victory over the German legions at Cremona.⁹ The retired or discharged tribune naturally returned to Rome where his father was a man of wealth and influence. How soon thereafter his marriage occurred is a matter of pure speculation. The birth of Suetonius Tranquillus should, however, be placed in 70 or 71 A. D., since he was *adulescens* and *adulescentulus* about 88, both of which designations imply an age of at least 17. The assumption by Macé¹⁰ that Nero recalled the thirteenth legion from Pannonia to Rome in 68 seems quite without foundation, for Tacitus¹¹ mentions by name the thirteenth legion as part of the army coming from Dalmatia and Pannonia to join the Othonian force being led north from Rome.

⁷ Cf. Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, III, p. 550.

⁸ Tacitus, *Hist.*, II, 11.

⁹ Tacitus, *Hist.*, III, 24.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

¹¹ *Hist.*, II, 11.

Probably Macé's worst fault is his disregard of the high rank of Suetonius' position, *ab epistulis Latinis*, thus belittling his whole career. On p. 65 he even refers to him as a lawyer without cases, a tribune without soldiers, a knight without a horse, and probably a teacher of grammar without pupils. This attempt to discredit Suetonius by calling him a schoolteacher has been properly ignored by the students of literature. Its only support is found in the titles *grammaticus*, given him by Suidas,¹² and *philologus* by Johannes Lydus.¹³ These late writers doubtless got the idea from the grammatical and philological works found among the writings of Suetonius. Nor does the term *scholasticus* applied to him about 96 A. D. by Pliny¹⁴ give any support to the theory that Suetonius was a teacher, for another letter¹⁵ of the same year proves that at the time he was a lawyer. This adjective is to be interpreted with its most natural and general meaning, scholarly, and this may apply to Suetonius during his whole career, as Pliny knew him, from his student days throughout his attempts as an advocate and his career as a public official.¹⁶

The description of Suetonius as *contubernalis* by Pliny¹⁷ creates more difficulty. They could not have been schoolboy friends, for Pliny was at least eight years older. Yet the association which this term suggests was so firmly established that its renewal appears in the form *in contubernium adsumpsi* in Pliny's letter to Trajan¹⁸ asking the *ius trium liberorum* for Suetonius. An intimate association of the two is indicated, and

¹² *S. v.* "Τράγκυλλος."

¹³ *De magistratibus*, I, 34.

¹⁴ *Ep.*, I, 24.

¹⁵ *Ep.*, I, 18.

¹⁶ Mr. H. C. Youtie reminds me that *σχολαστικός* meant advocate as early as the third century of our era and later public advocate, which is equivalent to the Latin *defensor civitatis*; see the new Liddell-Scott, *s. v.*, and, in Latin, *Codex Theodosianus*, VIII, 10, 2 (344 A. D.). The combination *scholasticus advocatus* may have appeared in Latin earlier, since the habit of forming new nouns from adjectives by ellipsis of the modified noun is well known in Latin; see Lane, *Latin Grammar*, 1102 and Rolfe, "The Formation of Latin Substantives . . . by Ellipsis," *T. A. P. A.*, XXXI (1900), pp. 1-26. Pliny, writing in the first century, finds no difficulty in applying both terms to the same man but he does not unite them.

¹⁷ *Ep.*, I, 24.

¹⁸ *Ep.*, X, 94.

this may have occurred when Suetonius was in training for his future career. Let us first discuss what that training must have been.

Certainly it was something more than the schools and law courts of Rome suggested by his appearance as an advocate in 96 A. D. For, as Macé¹⁹ points out, certain of his works were written in Greek. All well-educated Romans of his time knew more or less Greek, but to be able to write works in Greek implies an ability and interest in the language far beyond the ordinary. Suetonius must have spent some years in Greece or Greek-speaking provinces. Yet his modest circumstances suggested by Pliny²⁰ prevent our assuming that he studied for years in Greece and Asia Minor, as the son of a rich senatorial family might have done.

As we have shown above in discussing the military career of the father of Suetonius, men of equestrian rank choosing a military or civil career began with one or more minor military offices, as *praefectus fabrum* or *praefectus cohortis*, which served as introduction to a military tribuneship in a legion. Thereafter he might advance through a succession of military commands to the office of praetorian prefect, or through an almost equally distinguished and remunerative succession of procuratorships. Neither was the choice of military or civil career at this early age final, for we find many transfers recorded in the inscriptions giving the *cursus honorum* of men of rank. Stein²¹ adds that the duumvirate of municipal towns was also a stepping stone to the military tribunate.²² For the civil career there was an alternative entrance through such positions as *advocatus*, *advocatus fisci*, or *curator viarum*, but my search of Dessau's *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* yielded but fourteen instances against some seventy of a purely military beginning.

A comparison of R. H. Lacey's work just cited shows a still greater preponderance of military training for an official career. Of the thirty-three fairly complete records listed there fourteen

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 270.

²⁰ *Ep.*, I, 24.

²¹ *Der römische Ritterstand*, pp. 107 ff.

²² R. H. Lacey, *Equestrian Officials of Trajan and Hadrian*, lists six cases of preliminary duumvirate or similar office, which was followed by *praefectus cohortis* in four cases, by *praefectus fabrum* once, and by a procuratorship once.

officials began as *praefectus cohortis*, seven as *praefectus fabrum*, four as *primipilus*, and three as *tribunus militum*. One records *equestribus militiis functus* and in two cases a military career is certain though the first office is lost in lacuna. Against these there are but two certain cases where there was no preliminary military career. No. 85 is excluded from the count, though it begins with *procurator bibliothecarum*, since the preceding part of the inscription is lost.

Under the Republic young men of equestrian rank served ten years in the cavalry, but this requirement must have fallen into disuse or have been extensively evaded in the period of the civil wars. Under Augustus the cavalry consisted mostly of auxiliaries, while young men of equestrian rank served as subordinate officers in the army. This military service was obligatory.²³ Probably from the time of Claudius and certainly from the beginning of the second century three military commands must be held by young men of equestrian rank.²⁴ Appointment was by favor, as it had been under the Republic. We may compare Cicero²⁵ who introduced his young friend Trebatius to Caesar as follows: *huic ego neque tribunatum neque praefecturam neque ullius beneficii certum nomen peto, benevolentiam tuam et liberalitatem peto, neque impedio quo minus, si tibi ita placuerit, etiam hisce eum ornes gloriolae insignibus*, and Pliny²⁶ who records the granting of a tribuneship to Suetonius by the governor of Britain. Though it was the rule for an official career to follow the equestrian military commands, no right to such an official position was established. Appointment to a procuratorship rested on favor.²⁷ The duration of these military commands must have been at least one year each²⁸ but the total was doubtless less than the ten years' cavalry service required during the Republic. Often each command was held for several years.²⁹ As appointments were by favor, so also were

²³ Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, p. 548.

²⁴ Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, p. 549; Hirschfeld, *Römische Verwaltungsgeschichte*, p. 248; and Suetonius, *Claudius*, 25.

²⁵ *Ad Fam.*, VII, 5, 3.

²⁶ *Ep.*, III, 8.

²⁷ See Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, p. 559.

²⁸ See Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, p. 550.

²⁹ A military tribuneship for nine years is noted by Mommsen on the page just cited.

promotions. It was considered a *privilegium* to complete a command in six months.³⁰ The young soldier usually began as prefect, but this also rested on favor doubtless influenced by the positions available, for the centurionship, primipilate, and tribunate as first command have been noted above.³¹ Common soldiers who reached the primipilate through a succession of centurionships could have equestrian rank given and this opened an official career to them, but examples are not known before Marcus Aurelius.³²

We now return to Suetonius, a man of equestrian rank and son of a military tribune. He began his career with minor military offices, probably in accordance with a definite requirement. The various stages of his career, which finally led him to the high office of the imperial court, *ab epistulis Latinis*, are unknown to us; but in 101 A. D. Pliny³³ obtained for him a military tribuneship, which he declined but asked to have transferred to a relative. As both young men were of equestrian rank this was a military tribuneship *angusticlavius*, that is, the actual command of a legionary cohort. But we have just seen that this usually required minor military offices as a preparation. If both Suetonius and his relative Silvanus had already held a military tribuneship or had had the preliminary training we can understand how Pliny could both obtain and transfer the office so easily. Several prefectships might be held in succession and then be followed by a military tribuneship, which was also often repeated. The officer's pay may have been the incentive for these repetitions, when procuratorships were not obtained. Even the primipilate was sometimes repeated after holding prefectship and tribunate.³⁴

We are now ready to conjecture how Pliny as early as 96 A. D. could call Suetonius a *contubernalis*. This term meant originally a tent mate and so was used of soldiers who occupied the same tent, that is, ten common soldiers and a *decanus*. From

³⁰ See note 28 *supra*.

³¹ For men of equestrian rank as centurions and *primipili*, see Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, p. 504, n. 2 and Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 249, to which add Tacitus, *Hist.*, III, 6, the promotion of a *praefectus cohortis* to be *primus pilus* under Nero.

³² Mommsen, *op. cit.*, III, p. 560.

³³ *Ep.*, III, 8.

³⁴ See Mommsen, *C. I. L.*, V, 867.

this beginning the word developed three quite distinct meanings as shown by the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*: first, fellow soldiers; second, husband and wife, especially used of slaves; and third, intimate friends, who live together. We think we can infer from Pliny's correspondence that Suetonius did not live at his house during their early intimacy. Therefore the easiest explanation both of that early intimacy and of the term *contubernalis* is that they were fellow soldiers. If Pliny was *tribunus militum laticlavus* in Syria between 86 and 88 A.D.³⁵ it would have been possible for Suetonius to have entered military service at the same time, for the inscriptions show plenty of soldiers entering the service at eighteen or seventeen or even at sixteen. So far as we know this is the only time when Pliny could have been a fellow soldier with anyone. We see from Pliny's letters³⁶ that he had intimate association with two Greek philosophers during his military tribunate in Syria. Because of his many friends he must have had a wide choice of provinces where he might complete his military service. If he, because of his interest in Greek, or philosophy, chose Syria, the same thought may have caused Suetonius to search out a friend who would recommend him to the governor of Syria for his first command of equestrian rank. Such appointments under the same governor explain both the acquaintance of the two men, the use of the term *contubernalis* by Pliny, and the thorough command of Greek possessed by Suetonius. The latter may have stayed on in the province until he attained the military tribuneship, but it is equally possible that after two or three years, either finding promotion slow or life there unpleasant, he secured his discharge and tried the other entrance to official positions, that through the legal profession.³⁷ He may even have relied on his friendship with Pliny in making this change. He was doubtless successful and obtained some minor civil position. Later he probably asked Pliny to secure him a military tribuneship, because he again found promotion slow, and then refused it because in the meantime the desired promotion had come.

³⁵ See Mommsen, *Hermes*, III (1868), pp. 85 f.: under Domitian and before June 89; the military tribuneship by one of senatorial rank was regularly held after minor city offices and before the quaestorship.

³⁶ I, 10, 2, and III, 11, 5.

³⁷ Cf. Hirschfeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 253 ff.

This whole picture is pure conjecture but it has the advantage that it gives an adequate explanation to several rather contradictory statements concerning the career of Suetonius.

We know absolutely nothing of that official career except that it finally brought him to the position, *ab epistulis Latinis*, a procuratorship that paid 200,000 sesterces a year. This office under the emperors from Claudius to Vespasian was frequently held by a freedman, but Domitian gave the preference to men of equestrian rank for this and all similar positions. This trend continues under Nerva and Trajan, and the civil service may be considered fully established both in salaries and lines of promotion under Hadrian.

A few instances drawn from the careers of men whose *cursus honorum* is known will illustrate the natural succession of offices in a civil or combined civil and military career. L. Domitius Rogatus³⁸ started as *accensus velatus* and was then in succession prefect of the first cohort of the Dalmatians, prefect of the first Flavian cavalry cohort, military tribune of the sixth legion Victrix, prefect of the first cavalry regiment of the Aravaci, *ab epistulis* of Lucius Aelius, the Caesar (137 A. D.), procurator of the imperial mint, and *procurator Augusti* of the province of Dalmatia. The office of *ab epistulis* for the heir apparent was inferior to the same office with the emperor.

Sextus Caecilius Crescens³⁹ held the following offices: prefect of the army workmen, priest of a *curia*, advocate of the fiscus at Rome, procurator of the five percent inheritance tax, *ab epistulis* of the Emperor Antoninus, and *ab epistulis Augustorum*.

T. Varius Clemens⁴⁰ began as prefect of the second Macedonian cohort of Gauls, and continued as military tribune of the thirtieth Ulpian legion Victrix, prefect of the second cavalry regiment of the Pannonians, prefect of auxiliaries sent to Mauritania from Spain, prefect of the Britannic cavalry regiment of a thousand men, and in succession procurator of Cilicia, Lusitania, Mauretania Caesariensis, Raetia, and Belgica with Upper and Lower Germany, and finally *ab epistulis Augustorum* (Marcus Aurelius and Verus).

A very fragmentary inscription⁴¹ seems to show that [Quint]-ilius C. fil. after several minor offices became *ab commentariis*

³⁸ C. I. L., VI, 1607.

³⁹ C. I. L., VIII, 1174.

⁴⁰ C. I. L., III, 5215.

⁴¹ C. I. L., VI, 1564.

Corneli Re[pentini praef. praet., procurator of the province] of Macedonia, [assistant] to ab epistulis [Latinis], judge at Alexandria, [procurator of the province] of Asia, procurator summarum ratio[num, and ab epist]ulis Latinis.

Cn. Octavius Capito ⁴² was prefect of a cohort, military tribune, presented with military honors, procurator *ab epistulis* and of the paternal estate (of Domitian), *ab epistulis* a second time under the Emperor Nerva and presented by him with praetorian honors, *ab epistulis* for the third time under the Emperor Trajan, and finally prefect of the Vigiles. This is a dedicatory inscription and gives only an abbreviated *cursus honorum*.

Another dedicatory inscription ⁴³ still more abbreviated states that C. Calvisius Statianus was *advocatus populi* and *ab epistulis* of the Emperors (Marcus Aurelius and Verus?).

A dedicatory inscription of 376 A. D. ⁴⁴ records that Sextilius Agesilaus, a noted orator of the African courts, was in the council of the Emperors and likewise *magister libellorum et cognitionum sacrarum, magister epistularum, magister memoriae*, and finally *vicarius praefectorum per Hispanias*. *Magister* has taken the place of procurator and was so used by Spartianus cited above.

A fragmentary inscription ⁴⁵ shows that a man (name and early offices lost) was procurator of the Emperor Hadrian for the district of Alexandria, procurator of Greek and Latin libraries, *ab epistulis Graecis*, procurator of Lycia, Pamphylia, Galatia, Paphlagonia, Pisidia, and Pontus, procurator of the province of Asia and finally procurator of Syria.

This is a most important inscription, though the list of preliminary offices is lost, for it shows that the procuratorship of the libraries at Rome was an office from which promotion to *ab epistulis Graecis* was possible. This office was in turn inferior to *ab epistulis Latinis* though both paid 200,000 sesterces a year in the time of Hadrian. The director of libraries received only 100,000 sesterces. In this list of the *centenarii* were many officials of alimentation, of the aqueducts, of public works, etc. Below these came the procuratorships which paid 60,000 sesterces a year, such as *advocatus fisci*, prefect of the post, procurator

⁴² *C. I. L.*, VI, 798.

⁴⁴ *C. I. L.*, VI, 510.

⁴³ *C. I. L.*, V, 3336.

⁴⁵ *C. I. L.*, III, 431.

of the grain supply at Ostia, *adiutor* of studies, and many others. We even find counselors of the Emperor ⁴⁶ and *ab commentariis* of the praetorian prefect ⁴⁷ in this list.

It is plain that there were offices in Rome itself through which Suetonius could have advanced by regular stages to the high position of *ab epistulis Latinis*. Some of these, such as the record office of the praetorian prefect and the directorship of libraries, would have given him as free access to all libraries and archives as his highest office and, if we judge from the example of Pliny the Elder, these civil offices would have left him the needed leisure for writing his greatest works, the *De viris illustribus* and the *De vita Caesarum*.

It seems obvious that Suetonius was a public official in Rome from some time before 101 until 121 A. D., but we can only conjecture what the individual steps were in his promotion. The supposition of such a career makes understandable every allusion in Pliny's letters, even the rather casual way in which the *ius trium liberorum* is asked for and obtained without mentioning Suetonius' fame as a writer or his official position in the Emperor's service. These facts must have been so well known to the Emperor that it was necessary to mention only the wish and the intimate friendship of Pliny, in order to secure the desired honor. Such an absolutely necessary explanation of the seemingly inconsistent notices about the career of Suetonius may have been referred to casually by other scholars, but I have found only the hint by A. Stein,⁴⁸ who not only notes the high rank of the office *ab epistulis* but also states that it was the equestrian rank of his father that started Suetonius in this official career.⁴⁹

HENRY A. SANDERS.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN.

⁴⁶ *C. I. L.*, VI, 1634.

⁴⁷ *C. I. L.*, VI, 1564.

⁴⁸ *Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung*, X, p. 180.

⁴⁹ Lacey, *op. cit.*, p. 20, states that the position of secretary under Hadrian was doubtless the only office held by Suetonius.

ITALIC AND CELTIC.

The Indo-European family of languages includes ten surviving members, Indian, Iranian, Armenian, Albanian, Greek, Slavonic, Baltic, Germanic, Italic, and Celtic, and two that became extinct long ago, Hittite and Tokharian. Fragments of other extinct Indo-European languages have been identified, Illyrian, Phrygian, Thracian, Venetian, Messapian, Ligurian, which need not concern us.¹ Within this family the Celtic dialects are most closely akin to the Italic, and, as we might expect from the geographical position of the Celts when they first appear in history, there is also much that is common between Celtic and Germanic. These three, indeed, form a group of western Indo-European languages, to the exclusion of Greek.

In the first two volumes of Kuhn and Schleicher's *Beiträge zur vergleichenden Sprachforschung* the affinity between Italic and Celtic was first established by Schleicher and Lottner, and since then (1858-59) many scholars have discussed the question. Latin gen. sg. *uirī* = *fir* < **uirī* beside Greek ἱππον, ἱπποιο = Sanskrit *ásvasya*; Latin *sequitur* = *sechithir* beside Greek ἕπεται = Sanskrit *sacate* are correspondences that strike one immediately, and there are a great many more. The assimilation of *p* to *qu* in *quīnque* (πέντε, *pañca*) appears in *cóic*, W. *pump*, cf. *coquo* (πέσσω, *pacate*) *coic*, W. *pobaf*. The use of stems in *ā* and *s* as subjunctives is also characteristic of Celtic and Italic, although the *s*-subjunctive appears also in Greek and Sanskrit.² The future in *b* is peculiar to Latin and Irish. The suffix *-tion-*

¹ Venetian and Messapian are usually considered to be dialects of Illyrian, of which Albanian would be the chief representative.

² *V. K. G.*, II, § 609. Pedersen has made a good case for the view that the *s*-future of Sabellic is a distinct formation, and represents a future in *-es-* of Indo-European date, "Les Formes Sigmatiques," p. 23 (*Kgl. Danske Videnskab. Selskab*, Hist.-Fil. Meddelelser, III, no. 5 [1921]). This opinion is not supported by Vendryes, *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XXIII, p. 367. It is noteworthy that the *s*-subjunctive in Welsh regularly had a vowel before the *s*, but I will not venture into a discussion of the formation which is obscure. Pedersen makes an ingenious attempt to explain the Welsh system by a comparison with the Latin imperfect subjunctive, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-30; see also Lewis and Pedersen, *Concise Celtic Grammar*, § 454. It is not certain that Tokharian has an *ā*-subjunctive, *Toch. Gram.*, § 427.

of *natiō*, *natiōnis* occurs in Irish. The superlative of the type *maximus* is common to all Italic and Celtic dialects. Pedersen has shown that traces of an old declension in *ē*, which is the basis of the Latin fifth declension, survive in Irish.³ The prepositions *cum* and *dē* recur only in Celtic. And there are various other coincidences.⁴

More than twenty years ago Walde proposed a new theory concerning the affinity between Celtic and Italic.⁵ The Celtic dialects fall into two groups, Goidelic and Britannic, and one of the points of difference between them is that IE *qʷ* remains in Goidelic and becomes *p* in Britannic. The Italic dialects also comprise two groups, Latin and Sabellic (Oscan-Umbrian), and here too there is a contrast between Latin *qu* and Sabellic *p*: *quod* = Oscan *pod*. It is also a fact that the *b*-future of Latin and Irish is foreign to Oscan-Umbrian and Welsh, and it was then true that neither of these last had shown deponent forms in *-r*.⁶ Walde concluded that there never had been an Italo-Celtic period in the strict sense, nor ever a period of Italic linguistic unity. At first there was a period of Goidelo-Latin unity with Britannic and Sabellic as kindred dialects. Then the first group was divided by the migration of the Latin-speaking people into Italy, and Britannic and Goidelic united to form Celtic. The Sabellic speakers in their turn moved south, and the Celts spread westwards and eastwards as we know. Only after their migration into Italy did Sabellic and Latin speakers

³ "La Cinquième Déclinaison Latine," p. 78 (*Kgl. Danske Videnskab. Selskab*, Hist.-Fil. Meddelelser, XI, no. 5 [1926]).

⁴ A. Meillet, *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*, p. 16.

⁵ *Über älteste sprachliche Beziehungen zwischen Kelten und Italikern* (Innsbruck, 1917).

⁶ One such form had been claimed for Gaulish in the word *marcosior*. The inscription occurs on a stone spindle-whorl of the Roman period discovered at Autun in 1885, and published by Héron de Villefosse from two independent copies sent to him, *Bull. Arch.*, 1914, pp. 221 and 223. It reads MARCOSIOR
MATERNIA, and de Villefosse thought that the inscription consisted of two proper names. Other whorls, or perforated stones, in the same collection bear inscriptions in Latin or Gallo-Latin obviously addressed to women, and Loth proposed that *marcosior* was a 1st sg. pres. subj. deponent = *equitare uellem* in the obscene sense (*C. R. Acad. Inscr.*, 1916, p. 175). It is an ingenious interpretation, but quite uncertain. None the less, *marcosior* later appeared in the literature as proof of the deponent in Gaulish.

come into closer contact and share some new developments which mark the Italic dialects. These innovations should, however, be called Common Italic rather than Primitive Italic.

Walde's doctrine has found little support among linguists, so far as I can see. Pedersen,⁷ Meillet,⁸ Vendryes,⁹ and Hermann¹⁰ have all rejected it. Only Pokorny accepted it,¹¹ and he has since changed his mind (see *infra*).

Meillet stated his objections, and they invite an answer. The change from *qʷ* to *p* occurs in Greek and Roumanian and can have come independently in Sabellic and Britannic. Its absence in Irish may be due to a special difficulty on account of the absence of *p* in Celtic. Moreover, he suggested, Irish tends towards a voiceless articulation: initial IE *u* > *f*, whereas in Welsh it becomes *gw*, and intervocalic *t* > *þ* in Irish but *d* in Welsh.¹² Thus the *u* of *qʷ* was less effective in Goidelic. The absence of the *r*-deponent in Sabellic may be accidental, for lack of evidence. In Welsh it may be due to the late state of the language.

It must be observed that the *p* of Greek and Roumanian takes little from the importance of the fact that in two of the Italo-Celtic dialects the change takes place and in the other two it does not.¹³ The absence of *p* in Celtic must have presented equally great difficulty to both groups of Celtic speakers. With regard to the tendency towards a voiceless articulation in Irish, the change of initial *u*- to *f*- is the only such change that occurs, whereas voiceless consonants commonly become voiced in unstressed syllables. On the other hand, *l* and *r* regularly become voiceless in Welsh in initial position. But could a voiced *u* help to produce *p* from *qʷ*, and can we suppose that the *u* of *qʷ* was voiced? Anyway, the change of initial *u* occurs in Irish in the

⁷ "Le Groupement des dialectes indo-européens," p. 8, footnote (*Kgl. Danske Videnskab. Selskab, Hist.-Fil. Meddelelser*, XI, no. 3 [1925]).

⁸ *Les dialectes indo-européens*², p. 9.

⁹ *R. C.*, XLII (1925), p. 379.

¹⁰ *G. G. A.*, 1918, p. 343.

¹¹ *Z. C. P.*, XIII (1921), p. 295; *Ind. Anz.*, 1938-39, pp. 8, 79.

¹² This may be a much later differentiation, see *R. C.*, XLII, p. 199; *V. K. G.*, I, p. 430.

¹³ Thurneysen sees evidence in certain Gaulish forms against connecting the change in Sabellic with that in Britannic, and cites Welsh *nac* = Umbrian *nep*, *Z. C. P.*, XVI, p. 287, n. 2. Walde did not suggest that Sabellic and Britannic were originally one dialect.

7th cent. of our era and in Welsh in the 9th cent., and has therefore no possible relevance. As regards the deponent in *-r*, it will be seen that Meillet was right.

In a careful examination of Walde's monograph, Hermann reviewed the four points there raised. Walde had attempted to prove that IE *n* regularly became *en* in Irish as in Latin, and this is rightly denied. Hermann discounted the importance of the retention in Latin and Irish of IE *qʷ* on the ground that the corresponding media and media aspirata *gʷ* and *gʷh* show no such agreement: *gʷ* > *b* in both Irish and Welsh (Ir. *beo*, W. *bwyd*, Lat. *vivus*, *vita*); *gʷh* > *g* (Ir. *gor*, W. *gori*, Lat. *formus*). He pointed out that the change to *p* was rather evidence of kinship between Sabellic and Britannic. But it seems to me that the retention of *qʷ* is valid evidence. The *b*-future is conceded, and Hermann regards the ipf. in *-bam* as an Italic innovation. A review of his discussion of the *r*-forms may be dispensed with, as the problem appears in a new light since the discovery in Hittite and Tokharian of full paradigms in *r* with middle or passive meaning (Sturtevant, *Comp. Gr. of the Hittite Lang.*, §§ 420-21; Sieg, Siegling, and Schulze, *Toch. Gr.*, § 412). Moreover, a few early Welsh forms are now attested which appear to require interpretation as 2nd sg. subj. deponents (Lewis and Pedersen, *Concise Celtic Grammar*, p. 306), so that it can no longer be claimed that the deponent is foreign to Britannic. But, at the end of his analysis, Hermann presents (p. 359) a view of the relationship between the Italic and Celtic dialects which is instructive. He suggests the abandonment of the term Italo-Celtic, and draws an analogy between the Greek dialects of antiquity, with their conflicting isoglosses, and the dialects called Italic and Celtic respectively. Thus he draws a profitable lesson from Walde, while rejecting his thesis.

Vendryes later devoted an article to the same subject, and arrived for each point at a negative conclusion, agreeing with Hermann except that he denied even the *b*-future to be an innovation peculiar to Irish and Latin. The ipf. in *-bam* appears in Oscan (*fufans*), and Vendryes regards this as proof of its priority to the future in *-bo* which would be built upon it, although the latter is not attested in any Sabellic dialect. This argument loses its force, if one admits with Walde that the Italic period was subsequent to the period of close association

between Latin and Irish. Moreover, the priority of the ipf. in *-bam* is not generally admitted (Stolz-Schmalz, *Lat. Gr.*, ed. Leumann, p. 327).

Finally Vendryes points out that Sabellic has special affinity with Celtic in the matter of vocabulary,¹⁴ and he would connect the Oscan preterite in *-tt-* with the *t*-preterite of certain strong verbs in Old Irish.

The features peculiar to Latin and Irish are thus reduced to two: the retention of IE *qʷ* and the *b*-future. The coincidence of formation in *sequor* = *sechur* might also be considered. On the other hand, those peculiar to Latin and Sabellic are many: the mediae aspiratae become voiceless spirants, the indefinite-interrogative pronoun is used as relative, there is a considerable common vocabulary (see Meillet, *Dialectes*, p. 31). Walde says that these features date from a period of Common Italic after the migrations into Italy, and who can say from linguistic evidence that they must be earlier? The archaeologist, perhaps the anthropologist, may help to provide a solution. But there is a point at which some scholars will be content to leave the question open. It is not known where these peoples dwelt during the Italo-Celtic period (ca. 1500 B. C.).¹⁵ Many dialects of Italic and Celtic may have disappeared. Ligurian, of which little is known, shows affinity with Celtic.¹⁶ Venetian may have been a member of the wider group.¹⁷ But the isoglosses connecting Latin and Irish, Irish and Oscan, Sabellic and Britannic, Sabellic and Celtic, suggest that Walde may have done well in assailing the old stem-theory concept. Indeed, it has never recovered from his attack. It seems to me reasonable to suppose an Italo-Celtic period, perhaps in the latter part of the second millennium B. C., when the various dialects were in geographical association somewhere north of the Alps, and crossed by divergent isoglosses, and a later period when a Common Italic family was formed in the Italian peninsula and a Common Celtic family in southern Germany.

We are now involved in the consequences of supposing that the two dialects of Celtic were distinct in the second millennium.

¹⁴ Cf. Dottin, *La Langue Gauloise*, p. 130.

¹⁵ R. von Kienle, *W. u. S.*, XVII, p. 131.

¹⁶ P. Kretschmer, *K. Z.*, XXXVIII, p. 127.

¹⁷ F. Sommer, *I. F.*, XLII, p. 131.

The most striking fact about the fragments of Celtic that remain from all over the vast area that was later under Celtic domination is their uniformity.¹⁸ And the often quoted passage from St. Jerome about the similarity between the language of the Galatians and that of the Treveri confirms it, even if, as is now supposed, St. Jerome wrote, not from personal experience, but from an earlier source.¹⁹ If a single Celtic language had already separated into two dialects by 1000 B. C. we might expect marked differences of phonology, word-formation, and vocabulary in the extant remains, which are many centuries later. Walde meets this difficulty by assuming that Goidelic and Britannic, originally different Indo-European languages, merged into a Celtic unity only after the separation of Goidelic from Latin. But he then encounters another, namely that IE *p* disappears in Celtic, but Britannic *p* < IE *qʷ* remains. If the Celtic period is later than the Britannic, then Britannic *p* must have differed in some way from the original *p* so as to escape the sound-law. Walde concluded that, having developed from the complex *qʷ*-sound, it was different in some way, perhaps *pp*, and Pokorny adopted this in his article "Kelten" in Ebert's *Reallexicon*. It seems to me to be a weak point in Walde's argument. But I see no objection to supposing that the loss of IE *p* took place in Britannic and Goidelic while Goidelic was still in close contact with Latin. It would merely be an isogloss connecting those two dialects, which crossed other isoglosses connecting these. This hypothesis is in harmony with the evidence of linguistic geography. It is again the wave-theory as against the stem-theory. And it accords well with the most recent archaeological opinion regarding the Goidelic migration to Ireland. Crawford,²⁰ Hubert,²¹ and Mahr maintain that the Goidels came to Britain in the Bronze Age. Mahr insists in his latest monograph that the archaeological evidence requires this assumption, and dates the migration from Britain into Ireland *ca.* 900 B. C.²² It could

¹⁸ L. Weisgerber, "Galatische Sprachreste," *Natalicium J. Geffcken*, p. 151.

¹⁹ A. H. Krappe, *R. C.*, XLVI, p. 126.

²⁰ *Antiquaries Journal*, II, p. 27.

²¹ H. Hubert, *The Rise of the Celts*, pp. 187, 212, 241.

²² *P. P. S.*, 1937, p. 402. O'Rahilly's suggestion (*Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XXI [1935], p. 323), that Ireland was first occupied by Britannic Celts, and later invaded by the Helvetii (who would be *q*-speakers) after their defeat at Armecy, does not carry conviction.

then be the result of a disturbance which led to the merging of Britannic and Goidelic into one dialect, the Goidels who migrated to Britain, and finally to Ireland, alone preserving their ancient sounds.²³ Common Celtic then adopted the Britannic *p* which is what we find in Gaulish except for a few odd forms which Loth has, I think, successfully explained.²⁴ This explanation of the development of Italic and Celtic is merely the application of a principle demonstrated by Kretschmer for Greek, and indeed suggested for Italic also, *Einleitung*, p. 410.

Marstrand (N. T. S., III, p. 241), commenting on Meillet's discussion of Italo-Celtic (*Esquisse*, pp. 16 ff.), has sought to upset the Italo-Celtic theory by arguments diametrically opposed to those of Walde and directed to prove that the whole idea of close affinity between Italic and Celtic is false.²⁵ It must be admitted that he puts forward a strong case. The evidence of phonology, morphology, and vocabulary is considered. It is rightly pointed out that in the treatment of Indo-European *n* Celtic does not correspond to Italic as Walde had supposed. It is in his discussion of the morphological similarities that Marstrand finds himself most often at variance with other scholars, and the most important part of the evidence concerns morphology. His argument concludes with an impressive list of words for parts of the body, animals, vegetables, utensils, and so on, in the various dialects, which show no agreement. Marstrand argues (p. 250) that since Indian and Iranian had been separated for fifteen hundred years when our earliest documents took their present form, and still show such close resemblance, Italic and Celtic could not have undergone such profound alteration in vocabulary in a few centuries. This reasoning would be challenged by many scholars who hold the lapse of time to be much greater in the case of Italo-Celtic than in that of Indo-Iranian; and facts of vocabulary are not a cogent argument.

²³ It would be a part of the movement that brought the Urn-field culture into southwest Germany, and caused the Bronze Age Celtic migration into Catalonia, which Bosch-Gimpera claims to have established, see *Z. C. P.*, XX, pp. 344, 518; *Antiquity*, III, p. 33.

²⁴ *C. R. Acad. Inscr.*, 1909, p. 20. Vendryes regards the *qu*-forms in Gaulish as still unexplained, *Études Celtiques*, I, p. 356; *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XXIII (1937), p. 336.

²⁵ So also, for other reasons, G. Devoto, *Silloge Linguistica . . . Ascoli*, p. 200, but the article is not accessible to me.

Marstrander has found support from an unexpected quarter, and in a form which may not be acceptable to him. Pokorny, having first rejected his argument (*Z. C. P.*, XX [1936], p. 504), later became converted by archaeological evidence to the view that an Illyrian influence, common to Italic and Celtic, is responsible for the resemblance that exists, and that there never was any Italo-Celtic unity (*ibid.*, XXI [1938], p. 159). The whole doctrine of Illyrian influence is beyond my competence, but it is full of conjecture. The association of Urn-field culture and Illyrian speech, fundamental to his theory, is by no means established, and, even if it were, Pokorny's hypothesis remains mere guesswork.²⁶ Marstrander himself says: "les pauvres débris qui nous restent des idiomes illyriens n'indiquent aucune liaison avec le celtique" (*N. T. S.*, III, p. 250).

Pedersen, in 1931, reaffirmed unconditionally his belief in the relationship between Italic and Celtic, and, apparently replying to Marstrander, he says: "While we need go back only to 600 B. C. for the unity of Indian and Iranian, and perhaps no further for the unity of Slavonic and Baltic, we know definitely that the Italo-Celtic period of unity was much more remote. At the time when the two Aryan branches were separated only as dialects, there was already a vast difference between Italic and Celtic; and indeed, even within each of these branches there was a split which was already wide. Thus in any case we must go back several centuries, perhaps a thousand years, from 600 B. C. to reach a point where unity between Celtic and Italic could still be perceived" (*Ling. Science*, p. 313). Pedersen therefore assumes that early in the first millennium an original Celtic language had split into Britannic and Goidelic. This would not affect the possibility of the subsequent spread of Britannic as a Celtic *koinē* during the period of expansion after 600 B. C.

Meillet says that perhaps in the thirteenth century B. C. there was an Italo-Celtic nation whose language was more archaic than that of Homer or the Veda. Pokorny declares, with the archaeologist Pittioni, that the Italic culture took form after 900 B. C. out of a mixture of Illyrians and north Italian pre-Indo-European people, and that there was no Italo-Celtic nation. Marstrander

²⁶ See T. F. O'Rahilly, *Irish Historical Studies*, I, p. 306.

also denies the Italo-Celtic theory, but dismisses the notion of Illyrian elements in Celtic. Such matters are necessarily uncertain, and indeed perhaps doomed to remain so, since much of the evidence is irrecoverable. There is still plenty of room for different opinions.²⁷ The history of the Celts in particular is surrounded by a mist of obscurity, because the evidence of archaeology, as well as that of language, is still subject to widely different interpretations, and archaeologists and linguists have not been in coöperation. The first serious attempt by a linguist to interpret the archaeological evidence is that by Pokorny in his long study "*Zur Urgeschichte der Kelten und Illyrier*" (*Z. C. P.*, XX [1936], pp. 315 ff.; XXI [1938], pp. 54 ff.), already cited. But it is highly speculative. In the same year (1936) R. von Kienle published a detailed study of the Italo-Celtic question which is well documented.²⁸ He too lays emphasis on the evidence of pre-history, and arrives at conclusions which, while maintaining the notion of an Italo-Celtic group of dialects against Walde and Marstrander, exclude that of a period of Italo-Celtic unity, an Italo-Celtic nation in Meillet's sense. Prehistoric evidence would show that the Latin people were already in Italy *ca.* 1500 B. C. and that the Sabellic people came into the peninsula five hundred years later. There is no evidence of an earlier Italic unity. (This would confirm one part of Walde's hypothesis.) The features common to Italic and Celtic would have their origin in dialectal differences in the Indo-European period. Von Kienle sees Illyrian in a different relationship to Celtic from that suggested by Pokorny (pp. 150 f.). Illyrian, while close to Balto-Slavonic, would merely share some peculiarities with Italic and Celtic.

²⁷ Similarly, in a matter of detail, Meillet says of the verbal *r*-forms that they may mark a dialectal difference of Indo-European date (*Esquisse*, p. 20); Pedersen maintains that this would mean renouncing the notion of Indo-European unity, and that they must be a secondary innovation (*Groupement*, p. 12); Odé suggests that the *r*-forms had developed in Indo-European before the middle endings of Greek and Indo-Iranian (reported by Vendryes, *R. C.*, XLII, p. 411). Those who accept the Indo-Hittite theory would call the *r*-endings pre-Indo-European.

²⁸ *W. u. S.*, XVII, p. 98. Walde's opinion with regard to the similar development of Indo-European *n* in Italic and Celtic is here wrongly re-affirmed.

The most recent discussion is by Vendryes in his Rhys Lecture for 1937 (*Proc. Brit. Acad.*, XXIII, p. 333) entitled "La position linguistique du Celtique." After a brief review of the evidence, he concludes that Celtic has more in common with Italic than with any other member of the Indo-European family, and that a dialectal affinity does exist. There can, however, be no question of a connection as close as that between Indian and Iranian. The term Italo-Celtic should be understood merely as a "formula of linguistic correspondences." He therefore rejects the view of Meillet and Pedersen, and concedes something to Marstrander. There is much wisdom in the discussion, which is necessarily summary. The Illyrian hypothesis is dismissed as vain, and Vendryes sees little hope that archaeology can help the linguist.

After so many detailed studies, a general survey is welcome, and it is well to have an estimate by Vendryes as to how much is certain and how much surmise. But too great caution is sterile. It seems fair to hope that archaeology may establish, in the British Isles for example, a framework that linguists can use with reasonable probability. I have suggested above an application of some archaeologists' conclusions. And Vendryes' interpretation of the term Italo-Celtic tends to make it void of interest. Between Pedersen and Vendryes there appears a difference of temperament which leads to a wide difference of opinion.

Meanwhile two indispensable monographs have appeared to guide us through the maze of evidence and conjecture. Weisgerber in his "*Sprache der Festlandkelten*"²⁹ addresses himself to linguists and provides an exhaustive account of recent research, not without a positive contribution, and with admirable caution and completeness. Mahr presses his own opinions about the archaeological evidence in "*New Aspects and Problems in Irish Prehistory*,"³⁰ with a full discussion and a splendid bibliography comparable to that of Weisgerber.

The real uncertainty that exists is not always reflected in the language even of great authorities, and it is well for those who are not specialists to accept positive statements about prehistoric periods of Celtic language and civilization merely as learned

²⁹ *XX Bericht der Römisch-Germanischen Kommission*, 1931, p. 147.

³⁰ *P. P. S.*, 1937, p. 262.

opinions, not as established facts.³¹ Vendryes makes this clear. But the fact that the dialects which later appear as Italic and Celtic were members of a well-defined group, which we may call Italo-Celtic, during the latter half of the second millennium seems fairly well established. I suggest further that while Walde was wrong in supposing that, within this group, Goidelic and Latin were closer to each other than Sabellic or Britannic was to either of them, the group may have consisted of a number of dialects crossed by various isoglosses, not yet separated into two clearly marked families. Later the Sabellic and Latin dialects came into closer association in Italy and a distinct Celtic unity was formed by Britannic and Goidelic. A third period would begin for Celtic with the westward migrations of the Celts in the late Bronze Age, when Goidelic speakers invaded the British Isles, and a Britannic form of speech became the Celtic *koinē* on the continent.

MYLES DILLON.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

³¹ The work of Kraft and Bosch-Gimpera seems to throw new light on the early history of the Celts (G. Kraft, *Antiquity*, III, p. 33), but it has been questioned (*Z. C. P.*, XX, p. 343).

LUCRETIVS AND THE SIXTH BOOK OF THE *AENEID*.

To trace the development of an author's thought by discovering whence he borrowed his material, and how he used it, can be one of the most entertaining forms of literary criticism. With most classical authors this is a little difficult, because so much of their reading matter has been lost, but in the case of Vergil we are lucky enough to have the complete works of two authors who obviously had a very profound influence on him: Homer and Lucretius. Lucretius' influence is most obvious in the 6th *Eclogue* and the 2nd *Georgic*.¹ It is less conspicuous in the *Aeneid*, since the opportunity to show philosophic interests in an epic narrative is naturally limited. Moreover the whole teaching of the *Aeneid*, involving as it does the responsibility of the individual to the future, is diametrically opposed to Epicurean ethics, which upheld withdrawal from the world into intellectual seclusion. It is not surprising that many have felt that as Vergil grew older he grew away from Epicureanism and closer to Stoicism. The Sixth Book of the *Aeneid*, which seems to contradict the Epicurean doctrine of the mortality of the soul, is of course the main support of this thesis and may be interpreted as a rebuttal of Lucretius. A careful scrutiny of the language of the Sixth Book and of the associations evoked by phrases and words used in significant positions seems to me to indicate, however, that when Vergil was composing the *Aeneid* he was still in many ways very much an Epicurean. Indeed it would have been somewhat difficult for him to continue living in the *hortulus Cecropius* at Naples on any other terms. Much

¹ The bibliography of scholarly work dealing with the influence of Lucretius on Vergil is extensive, but I have not been able to discover any treatment of the material with which I am concerned here. In collecting it I have found many valuable clues in Conington's edition of the *Aeneid* and Norden's edition of the Sixth Book. Rostagni's *Virgilio Minore* encouraged me to feel that I was on the right track. I should perhaps mention Merrill's painstaking collection of parallels ("Parallels and Coincidences in Lucretius and Vergil," *Univ. of California Publ. in Classical Philology*, III [1918], p. 135) but it is not very illuminating because of its omission of contexts. M. E. Hirst ("The Gates of Vergil's Underworld," *C. R.*, XXVI [1912], p. 82) saw the connection but did not carry the suggestion any further.

of his vocabulary in his descriptions of Hades indicates that even here he was thinking in terms of Epicurean physics, particularly the theory of images, and some of these descriptions have more meaning if one reads them while keeping in mind the passages from the *De Rerum Natura* which they suggest. A somewhat detailed discussion of the passages in question will, I think, enable us to approach the thorny question of how to interpret the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid* from an angle which may not be entirely new but may be slightly different.

At the very moment when Aeneas plunges into the underworld we are reminded of Lucretius by a very firmly established association of words:²

Ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram
Perque domos Ditis *vacuas* et *inania* regna
(VI, 268-9).

It would be difficult to read the words *vacuas* and *inania* thus juxtaposed without being reminded of the *vacuum inane* of Epicurean physics. Our thoughts once turned in this direction, we are not surprised to find an Epicurean theory introduced to give uncanny atmosphere:

quale per incertam lunam sub luce maligna
est iter in silvis, ubi caelum condidit umbra
Iuppiter, et *rebus nox abstulit atra colorem*
(VI, 270-2).

This is a more poetic statement of Lucretius' words describing the atoms:³

Praeterea *quoniam nequeunt sine luce colores*
Esse, neque in lucem existunt primordia rerum,
Scire licet quam sint nullo velata colore.
Qualis enim caecis poterit color esse tenebris?
(II, 795-8).

We follow Aeneas to the Gates of Hell where are gathered the personifications of all the sorrows of humanity. Beyond this is the tree of dreams:

² I have throughout italicized the words in the quotations upon which the associations depend.

³ This association was pointed out by Servius who tells us (*Aen.*, VI, 272): *Hoc et videmus et tractatur ab Epicureis, rebus tollere noctem colorum varietatem: unde etiam apud inferos omnia nigra esse dicuntur.*

In medio ramos annosaque brachia pandit
 Ulmus opaca ingens, quam sedem Somnia vulgo
 Vana tenere ferunt, foliisque sub omnibus haerent
 (VI, 282-4).

This tree is the subject of much discussion. Norden was unable to find any prototype for it and has been forced, as in the case of the Golden Bough, to assume that Vergil drew the idea from the common stock of ancient folklore.⁴ It is also a little difficult to explain why Vergil introduces, after the dreams, the Centaurs, the twyformed Scyllae, and other "long legged beasties." Norden finds precedent for all of these as residents of Hades, except the Centaurs. He is forced to assume that Vergil found the Centaurs as daimonic characters in the model he was following, which has since disappeared.⁵ It is, however, more than suggestive that twice in Lucretius we find the Centaurs grouped with that curious plural form of the Scyllae. The parallel is duly pointed out by Norden, but only for the philological interest.⁶ In Book IV, 722 ff., Lucretius explains how the insubstantial nature of images accounts for our ability to conceive of beings which never have existed, or no longer do exist, and our consequent ability to see them unless our reason rejects them. (To him, to imagine an object and actually to see it appear to be practically the same thing.) The fineness of the images makes it possible for them to become entangled and to blend, producing hybrids. He continues:

*Centauros itaque et Scyllarum membra videmus
 Cerbereasque canum facies simulacraque eorum
 quorum morte obita tellus amplectitur ossa,
 omne genus quoniam passim simulacra feruntur*
 (IV, 732-5).

The connection here with visions of the dead is also significant. It establishes firmly the association of these imaginary creatures with Hades. The Epicurean does not deny the possibility that we may see visions of the dear departed, which are really their *simulacra*. He does deny that the dead *themselves* exist, any more than the mythical beasts. The Centaurs and Scyllae are found together again in Book V, 890-4 in another context. Here Lucretius is explaining why it is impossible for such

⁴ E. Norden, *P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis, Buch VI*, p. 216.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 215.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*

"Mischwesen" to exist. We find added to this list of impossibilities the Chimaera and giants, who also appear in Vergil's colony by the tree of dreams. In Vergil these creatures are usually distinguished by editors from the false dreams which nested in the great elm tree, but, in view of their constant association with dreams in Lucretius' mind, it does not seem too far-fetched to identify the two groups and thus explain the presence of the Centaurs and all the other creatures in this passage. Besides being mythological characters they are all possessed of some physically impossible feature such as Lucretius describes. These apparitions, with which he seems painfully familiar, he groups on an equal footing with visions of the dead (IV, 29-41). How important these visions seemed to him we know from the lines in Book I in which he includes them among the main problems with which he plans to deal (I, 127-35).

With so many more or less obvious associations with Lucretius in the first twenty-six lines of the descent to Avernus one naturally hopes to find more that are not quite so evident. And they are there. At the actual entrance to Hades we find camped before it the personified Sins and Sorrows:

Vestibulum ante ipsum primis in faucibus Orci
Luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae;
pallentesque habitant Morbi tristisque Senectus,
et Metus et malesuada Fames ac turpis Egestas,
terribiles visu formae, Letumque Labosque;
tum consanguineus Leti Sopor et mala mentis
Gaudia, mortiferumque adverso in limine Bellum,
ferreique Eumenidum thalami et Discordia demens
vipereum crinem vittis innexa cruentis (VI, 273-81).

Many editors have pointed out here the resemblance to the passage in the third book of Lucretius, in which he explains how the fear of death has ruined many a man's life:

haec vulnera vitae
non minimam partem mortis formidine aluntur.
turpis enim ferme contemptus et acris egestas
semota ab dulci vita stabilique videtur,
et quasi iam leti portas cunctarier ante (III, 63-7).

With this clue to start us, can we find any other similarity between the two passages? Lucretius tells us how, when they are

as wretched as they can be, the fear of death often drives men to the comfort of religion:

extorres idem patria longeque fugati
 conspectu ex hominum, foedati crimine turpi,
 omnibus *aerumnis adfecti* denique vivunt,
 et quocumque tamen *miseri* venere parentant
 et nigras mactant pecudes et manibu' divis
 inferias mittunt, multoque *in rebus acerbis*
 acrius advertunt animos ad religionem (III, 48-54).

Vergil's *Luctus* certainly describes their situation adequately. Before this Lucretius tells us that men pretend to fear diseases, or disgrace, more than death, but that this is only bragging:

nam quod saepe homines *morbos* magis esse timendos
 infamemque ferunt vitam quam *Tartara* leti
 et se scire animi naturam sanguinis esse
 aut etiam venti, si fert ita forte voluntas,
 nec prorsum quicquam nostrae rationis egere,
 hinc licet advertas animum magis omnia laudis
 iactari causa quam quod res ipsa probetur
 (III, 41-7).

In turning to Vergil we find *Metus*, *Letum*, *Morbi*, and *Senectus*, which to the Roman mind seems to be almost a disease in itself. Lucretius tells us that Greed, which regards poverty as next to death, forces men to tremendous struggles in the effort to acquire wealth and sometimes even drives them to crime:

denique *avarities* et honorum caeca cupido
 quae miseros homines cogunt transcendere fines
 iuris et interdum socios scelerum atque ministros
 noctes atque dies niti praestante *labore*
 ad summas emergere opes, haec volnera vitae
 non minimam partem mortis formidine aluntur
 (III, 59-64).

We are reminded of Vergil's *malesuada Fames*, *acris Egestas*, and *Labos*. In order to gain their ends, Lucretius tells us, men start civil wars and rejoice in the death of their kinsmen:

unde homines dum se falso terrore coacti
 effugisse volunt longe longeque remosse,
sanguine civili rem conflant divitiasque
 conduplicant avidi, *caedem caede accumulantes*,
crudeles gaudent in tristi funere fratris
 et consanguineum mensas odere timentque
 (III, 68-73).

We may see the reflection of these details in Vergil's *mortiferum bellum*, the *Eumenides*, and *Discordia*, and may explain from line 72 his peculiar expression *mala mentis Gaudia*. The "evil joys of the mind" might, after all, cover a very wide range of human pastimes, but from the association with the Lucretian passage we may be justified in diagnosing them as fratricidal. Vergil had already used the same suggestion in the second *Georgic* when he is describing the pursuits of those not fortunate enough to be farmers:

. . . gaudent perfusi sanguine fratrum
(*Georg.*, II, 510).

Is it going too far to see in Lucretius' description of human follies the picture which suggested to Vergil's mind the evil creatures which introduce men to their own hells? We shall see later how the description of Tartarus, which he puts into the mouth of the Sibyl, harks back again to this passage in Lucretius and is also connected with the Lucretian idea that men make their own hell for themselves. The difference between the two writers is well illustrated by their attitudes here. Lucretius is struck and vexed by the stupidity of men while Vergil sees the pathos of the suffering which it brings upon them.

After Aeneas and the Sibyl have crossed the Styx they come to the place of those who die before their time. One group here, the suicides, is described in terms which suggest that Vergil had Lucretius' words in mind as he wrote, as he well might if there is any truth in the story that Lucretius killed himself:

proxima deinde tenent maesti loca, qui sibi letum
insones peperere manu *lucemque perosi*
proiecere animas. quam vellent aethere in alto
nunc et pauperiem et *duros perferre labores*
(VI, 434-7).

Lucretius describes the desire to die in the same terms, as hatred of light which he so often equates with life:

et saepe usque adeo mortis formidine vitae
percipit humanos odium lucisque videndae,
ut sibi consciscant maerenti pectore letum
obliti fontem curarum hunc esse timorem
(III, 79-82).

The pathetic wish of the suicides is of course closely related to the speech of Achilles in the *Odyssey*:

βουλοίμην κ' ἐπάρουρος ἔων θητενέμεν ἄλλω,
 ἀνδρὶ παρ' ἀκλήρῳ ᾧ μὴ βίωτος πολὺς εἴη,
 ἢ πᾶσιν νεκέεσσι καταφθιμένοισιν ἀνάσσειν

(XI, 489-91),

but it also contains a phrase reminiscent of two passages in the *De Rerum Natura*: "duros perferre labores." In III, 990 Lucretius uses the expression, apropos of Tityos "aeternum poterit perferre dolorem," and in III, 999 in connection with Sisyphus "durum sufferre laborem."

From here we follow Aeneas through his encounters with Dido, the Greek heroes, and Deiphobus, until he comes to the gates of Tartarus. Since he may not enter, the interior is described to him by the Sibyl. Her speech has always seemed to me the flattest part of the book, a passage which might have been inserted as a concession to literary convention or to a scholarly love of mythology. If, however, while reading these lines, one bears in mind Lucretius' description of the Tortures of Hell, they become much more interesting. Whether Vergil intended the characters whom he places in Tartarus also to be interpreted as allegorical figures, one cannot say, but one can at least see by what train of thought they may have come into the picture and can find in them the "lacrimae rerum" which otherwise seem strangely lacking in this episode.

At the end of Book III Lucretius attacks the popular conception of Hades and tells us that there is no true hell except what we make for ourselves here on earth:

Atque ea nimirum quaecumque Acherunte profundo
 prodita sunt esse, in vita sunt omnia nobis

(III, 978-9).

The stock creatures of the mythical Hades had been to Lucretius symbols of human folly and wickedness. Tantalus, dreading the stone which hangs above his head, represents the fear of the gods and of fate:

nec miser inpendens magnum timet aere saxum
 Tantalus, ut famast, cassa formidine torpens;
 sed magis in vita divom metus urget inanis
 mortalis, casumque timent quem cuique ferat fors

(III, 980-3).

Tantalus' name appears to have been lost in the lacuna in Vergil's text, but we cannot be wrong in identifying him from the description:

quo super atra silex iam iam lapsura cadentique
 imminet adsimilis; lucent genialibus altis
 aurea fulcra toris, epulaeque ante ora paratae
 regifico luxu; furiarum maxima iuxta
 accubat et manibus prohibet contingere mensas,
 exsurgitque facem attollens atque intonat ore

(VI, 602-7).

Lucretius cites Tityos, with his vitals everlastingly torn by birds, as the type of the lover:

sed Tityos nobis hic est, in amore iacentem
 quem volucres lacerant atque exest anxius angor
 aut alia quavis scindunt cuppedine curae

(III, 992-4).

Vergil describes the same character with more sympathy for his unhappy situation:

nec non et Tityon, Terrae omniparentis ⁷ alumnum,
 cernere erat, per tota novem cui iugera corpus
 porrigitur, rostroque immanis vultur obunco
 immortale iecur tondens fecundaque poenis
 viscera rimaturque epulis habitatque sub alto
 pectore, nec fibris requies datur ulla renatis

(VI, 595-600).

To a good Epicurean political ambition is one of the greater follies, and Lucretius represents its evil consequences by the figure of Sisyphus:

Sisyphus in vita quoque nobis ante oculos est
 qui petere a populo fascēs saevasque secures
 imbibit, et semper victus tristisque recedit.
 nam petere imperium, quod inanest nec datur umquam,
 atque in eo semper durum sufferre laborem,
 hoc est adverso nixantem trudere monte
 saxum quod tamen e summo iam vertice rursum
 volvitur et plani raptim petit aequora campi

(III, 995-1002).

Vergil probably shared this point of view towards the desire for office, but in the Augustan age another aspect of its folly was more apparent. It was not merely a platitude when Horace said:

⁷ *Omniparens* is a rather uncommon word which occurs twice in Lucretius as an adjective for *terra*, once in II, 706, where he has been explaining the generation of species and cites our old friend the Chimaera as an example of what cannot happen *per terras omniparentis*, and again in the magnificent, if unoriginal, line which describes the earth as *omniparens eadem rerum commune sepulcrum* (V, 259). In both cases an association with the underworld is not far to seek.

. . . celsae graviore casu
decidunt turres feriuntque summos
fulgura montis.

Vergil has been impressed by the same aspect of ambition and instead of Sisyphus he shows us first the Titans⁸ and the Aloidae who tried to drive Jupiter from heaven (VI, 580-4) and then Sisyphus' unhappy but more picturesque brother Salmoneus:

vidi et crudelis dantem Salmonea poenas,
dum flammam Iovis et sonitus imitatur Olympi.
quattuor hic invectus equis et lampada quassans
per Graium populos mediaeque per Elidis urbem
ibat ovans, divumque sibi poscebat honorem,
demens, qui nimbos et non imitabile fulmen
aere et cornipedum pulsu simularet equorum
(VI, 585-91).

In an age in which human ambition could reach for divinity such a picture would be much more striking than Sisyphus plodding dully up the hill. Lucretius ends his list of types with the Danaids who represent futile greed (III, 1003-10). There seems to be no parallel for them in Vergil's Tartarus, where, however, we find the Lapiths, Ixion, and Pirithous (VI, 601). Since the lacuna which swallowed Tantalus' name has also deprived us of any further details about these last famous sinners, we cannot say what association suggested them to Vergil from all the rank and file of myth. In view of the lacuna I would hesitate to do more than point out that both Ixion and his son Perithous were on occasion involved with those Centaurs who in this connection sometimes emerge from Vergil's subconscious.⁹

Thus out of the six characters or groups of characters in the first part of Vergil's Tartarus (the Titans, the Aloidae, Salmoneus, Tityos, the Lapiths, and Tantalus) five may be in-

⁸ The Titans are used as symbols of overweening ambition by Horace also in *Odes*, III, 4, when he advises the use of *vim temperatum* instead of *vis consili expers*. One glimpses Antony behind the giants.

⁹ Ixion's connection is the more interesting. He became the father of a Centaur, by a shade which was created by Zeus in the shape of Hera to deceive him. Such a tale might well be called to mind by Lucretius' discussion of impossible "Mischwesen" and his relation of the images to the futility of love. The grotesque outcome of Ixion's passion for the Queen of Heaven makes him a good illustration of the latter idea.

terpreted in an allegorical way which gives the picture much more depth, if we keep in mind Lucretius' words.

After Vergil has described specific mythological characters, he introduces some human sinners under general headings: those who hated their brothers, beat their fathers, or cheated their clients, or who were misers, adulterers, and traitors. Theseus and Phlegyas interrupt this second series of sinners, apparently as examples of impiety, and then we return to the nameless, ending with more varieties of traitors, and committers of incest.

This galaxy does not seem to have been suggested by the same passage in Lucretius as the former group, but it has a familiar sound which is explained if we turn again to the beginning of Lucretius' third book and his list of the crimes to which the fear of death drives mankind. We find an interesting series of parallels:

1. Vergil:

Hic quibus *invisi fratres*, dum vita manebat,
pulsatusve *parens* aut *fraus innexa clienti* (608-9).

Lucretius:

crudeles gaudent in tristi funere fratris
et consanguineum mensas odere timentque (72-3).

hunc vexare pudorem, hunc vincula amicitiai
rumpere et in summa pietatem evertere suadet;
nam iam saepe homines patriam carosque parentes
prodiderunt, vitare Acherusia templa petentes
(83-6).

2. Vergil:

aut qui *divitiis soli incubuere* repertis
nec partem posuere suis . . . (610-11).

Lucretius:

denique *avarities*, et *honorum caeca cupido*
quae miseros homines cogunt transcendere fines
iuris . . . (59-61).

conduplicant *avidi* *divitiasque*
(70-1).

3. Vergil:

quique ob *adulterium caesi* (612).

Lucretius:

hunc vexare pudorem (83).

4. Vergil:

. . . quique arma secuti
impia nec veriti dominorum fallere dextras (612-13).

Lucretius:

sanguine civili rem conflant . . . (70).

. . . hunc vincula amicitiai
rumpere et in summa pietatem evertere suadet;
nam iam saepe homines patriam . . .
prodiderunt . . . (83-6).

These pairs cannot all be called close parallels, nor are there always even approximate parallels for all the ideas in either passage, but the thought is close enough in meaning and expression to be interesting in this connection.

At the appointed spot Aeneas leaves the Golden Bough and they pass on to the place of the Blessed:

His demum exactis, perfecto munere divae,
devenere locos laetos et amoena virecta
fortunatorum nemorum sedesque beatas.
largior hic campos aether et lumine vestit
purpureo, solemque suum, sua sidera norunt
(VI, 637-41).

The influence of Lucretius' famous imitation of Homer, in his description of the gods' home, is obvious here:

. . . semperque innubilus aether
integit et large diffuso lumine rident (III, 21-2).

There is, however, in the fourth book of Lucretius a description of dreams which conveys much more of the uncanny atmosphere of Aeneas' journey:

denique cum suavi devinxit membra sopore
somnus et in summa corpus iacet omne quiete,
tum vigilare tamen nobis et membra movere
nostra videmur, et in noctis caligine caeca
cernere censemus solem lumenque diurnum,
conclusoque loco caelum mare flumina montis
mutare et campos pedibus transire videmur,
et sonitus audire, severa silentia noctis
undique cum constent, et reddere dicta tacentes
(IV, 453-61).

This can, of course, be read as a perfectly straightforward description of the phenomena of dreams, but I should think that anyone who had ever had a nightmare, or a high fever, would

recognize the shadow which then surrounds the light in which one moves, and the endless wandering under a lowering sky. *In noctis caligine caeca* may mean simply "although the night is dark" and *concluso loco* may mean "within our own four walls," but it is one of the virtues of great poetry that it often seems to mean a great deal more than the author originally intended; and can touch off an image in another poet's mind which results in something quite different. I should not be surprised if Lucretius' haunting description contributed something to Vergil's first picture of the dark underworld, in which only the fields of the blessed knew sun and stars, and of Aeneas' troubled wanderings among the shadows.

. . . sit numine vestro
pandere res *alta terra et caligine mersas*.
Ibant obscuri sola sub nocte per umbram
perque domos Ditis vacuas et inania regna:
quale per incertam lunam sub luce maligna
est iter in silvis, ubi caelum condidit umbra
Iuppiter, et rebus nox abstulit atra colorem

(VI, 266-72).

These lines are full of the same eerie twilight that Lucretius felt in his dreams.¹⁰

¹⁰ We may note here the relation between this passage in Lucretius and Vergil's most successful description of a dream, that of Dido after Aeneas has left her:

. . . agit ipse furem
in somnis ferus Aeneas, semperque relinqui
sola sibi, semper longam incommitata videtur
ire viam et Tyrios deserta quaerere terra,
Eumenidum veluti demens videt agmina Pentheus
et solem geminum et duplices se ostendere Thebas
aut Agamemnonius scaenis agitatus Orestes,
armatam facibus matrem et serpentibus atris
cum fugit ultricesque sedent in limine Dirae

(*Aeneid*, IV, 465-73).

The mythological and theatrical details at the end have always seemed to me to spoil a very moving passage, but the connection between dreams and these impossible creatures of the imagination, which is provided by the Lucretian theory of the images, at least explains what they are doing here. The double sun and the two Thebes, which seem particularly irrelevant to Dido's sorrow, must have slipped in at the tail end of Vergil's train of thought, for, just before Lucretius describes dreams in the passage quoted above (IV, 453-61) he is explaining how one can make oneself see double by pressing a finger against the eyeball.

Anchises' explanation of the *anima mundi* is not a passage in which one would expect to find much evidence of sympathy with the passionate materialism of Lucretian thought, but it provides a very interesting example of similarity in language and tone combined with almost complete difference of content. That a doctrine so utterly opposed to his own should be presented in such a way that one could almost swear the words were spoken by Lucretius himself—Lucretius polished and perhaps a little subdued, but still perfectly recognizable—would be enough to make even his ashes spin in their urn. But the fact remains that, if Vergil had never read Lucretius, Anchises' speech could never have been written as it stands.¹¹

With this survey of Lucretian associations in the Sixth Book of the *Aeneid* I hope that I have made this point: Vergil as he wrote the Sixth Book was still very much under the influence of many of the Epicurean theories which were part of his daily life in the *hortulus Cecropius*. The physics of Epicurus he still accepted and he used the theory of images to provide the setting for the high point of his epic. He gives plenty of hints to guide his friends to the scientific explanation of Aeneas' journey to the underworld but does not spoil the narrative by being explicit or weaken the effect of the episode by making its nature obvious. I feel sure that Vergil meant Aeneas' journey to Hades to be interpreted as a dream by those versed in the Epicurean theories of dreams and visions, while he left it to be taken as a real episode by the uninitiated. This would explain the statement at the end of the book that Anchises sent Aeneas and the Sibyl back to the upper world by the Ivory Gate through which the Manes send dreams instead of letting them retrace their steps, as other visitors to Hades had done. Aeneas and his companion are thus put in the same category as the *falsa insomnia*. The

¹¹ The Lucretian associations here seem to support the thesis that Vergil in his picture of Anchises had in mind Ennius' description of Homer's appearance to him and his revelation of the *rerum natura*. Lucretius refers to this (I, 119-26) and may thus have suggested the device to Vergil while he was collecting the material and putting together the plot for the Sixth Book, or rather have reminded him of a scene with which he must have been familiar. Cf. Pascal, *Commentationes Vergilianae*, pp. 143 ff., where the whole of Anchises' speech, not just the idea for the episode, is thought to have been taken from Ennius.

Aeneas of the underworld is a dream dreamed by the true Aeneas. The introduction of the tree of dreams at the entrance to Hades and its association with the theory of images must have been meant as the clue to the interpretation.¹²

If, however, he still accepted the physics of Epicureanism, it is quite clear that he had discarded its ethics in one cardinal point. The difference between Vergil's point of view and Lucretius' on the question of participation in public affairs cannot be better illustrated than by comparing two famous passages which contain another striking verbal association:

ut satius multo iam sit parere quietum
quam *regere imperio* res velle et regna tenere
(Lucretius, V, 1129-30).

tu *regere imperio* populos, Romane, memento
(hae tibi erunt artes), pacisque imponere morem,
parcere subiectis ac debellare superbos
(*Aeneid*, VI, 851-3).

Here Vergil sets forth his challenge to Lucretius and we see what the whole book has been leading up to. Aeneas leaves Hades with his mind intent upon the future, not his own future but that of his descendants. To the true Epicurean such a preoccupation would be simply silly, but Vergil has hoist the Epicureans with their own petard. He has used their own physics, the material and often the very words of their greatest exponent, to preach against the principle on which their secure and peaceful lives were founded, and he sends out his hero, following a dream, to labor for a future he will never see.

AGNES KIRSOPP MICHELS.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

¹² E. L. Highbarger in his recent book, *The Gate of Dreams* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies in Archaeology, No. 30) sees marked Platonic influence in the latter part of the Sixth Book and interprets the whole journey through Hades as an allegory of the soul (Chap. VIII, especially p. 110). Such an observation does not seem to me necessarily at variance with my own interpretation. A poem like the *Aeneid* is difficult to understand largely because it can mean so many different things.

THE METHOD OF CHOOSING ARCHONS IN ATHENS UNDER THE EMPIRE.

In his study of the Athenian archons under the Empire Graindor finds that the archonship no longer rotates on the basis of tribal cycles.¹ A glance at lists where the succession of archons is certain shows no official order; in fact, we find the same tribe holding the archonship for two years in succession.² The appearance in the Archon lists of Roman emperors like Domitian, Hadrian, Gallienus, and foreign princes like Rhoe metalces and Antiochos Philopappos seems to show a direct election. It is the aristocratic character of the office during this period which in part leads Graindor to this conclusion. Though the archonship had lost its political and administrative importance, its prestige increased. The archonship is the *μεγίστη ἀρχή*,³ the *summus magistratus*;⁴ it is a *λειτουργία*⁵ entailing expense; in the list of archons there appear the names not only of emperors and princes but the names of illustrious people like the historians Arrian and Dexippus, and members of other distinguished Athenian families. These considerations lead Graindor to conclude that aside from the fact that the archonship was an elective office during the Empire period we know nothing of the method followed in the choosing of archons.

Graindor dates the change in the method of choosing archons from 103/2, the date in Ferguson's earlier work when the secretary cycles in the prytany-secretaryship stopped. Furthermore, Graindor claims that Ferguson's law was not reestablished in the Empire period.⁶ The writer has shown that the evidence brought forth by Graindor does not confirm his assumption; in fact we now have definite evidence for the existence of Ferguson's law in the second century of the Empire period.⁷ Though

¹ P. Graindor, *Chronologie des archontes athéniens sous l'Empire* (*Mémoires de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, VIII [Brussels, 1922]), p. 14, n. 1.

² *Ibid.*, p. 13.

³ Dio Cassius, LXIX, 16.

⁴ *Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Vita Gallieni*, 11, 3.

⁵ Philostratus, *Vitae Sophistarum*, II, 20, 1.

⁶ Graindor, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

⁷ J. A. Notopoulos, "Ferguson's Law in Athens under the Empire," *A. J. P.*, LXIV (1943), pp. 44-55.

Ferguson's law is now positively established for the Empire period, the scarcity of inscriptions containing both archon and secretary forces us to approach the chronology of the archons almost completely deprived of the valuable service that Ferguson's law renders to Athenian chronology.

When it comes to the archons of the Empire period we note some interesting facts. Whereas the eponymous archonship in the period between 301/0 and 91/0 is held mostly by inconspicuous people and we rarely know their demotic or patronymic, the eponymous archons of the Empire period are for the most part conspicuous people. The prestige of the office is shown by the archon lists themselves. Dow has pointed out "that out of 2788 inscriptions (plus those in Addenda) published in *I. G.*² II-III, *partes* I-II, only one is a list of *archontes* prior to ca. 100 B. C. . . . In the next period, when the Areopagos had grown strong, lists for one year each were thereafter not infrequently inscribed, each on a separate small stele, in the bold letters of the time."⁸ The prestige of the office is further shown by the very frequent presence of the demotic. This is in marked contrast to the rare presence of the demotic with the archons of the previous period. It shows that the prestige of the office was shared in the Empire period by the deme and tribe from which the archons came. A study of the archons of this period shows a strong tribal consciousness. The proportion of archons that come from the demes of Marathon and Phaleron of the tribe Aiantis is an index of this tribal consciousness which is further illustrated by the fact that the emperors Commodus, Hadrian, Philopappos, the king of Commagene, and probably Domitian, Severus Alexander, and Gallienus, all appear to have been enrolled in the deme Besa of Hadrianis.⁹ It will be the object of this paper to show that tribal consciousness was still strong in the Empire period and that, though the tribe was not as important politically as before, it still continued to be an active unit in the distribution of the archonship. A study of the archonship which dismisses the subject with the categorical statement that it was an elective office without studying the archonship in the context of tribal distribution is likely to mis-

⁸ S. Dow, "The Lists of Athenian *Archontes*," *Hesperia*, III (1934), p. 183.

⁹ J. H. Oliver, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia*, XI (1942), p. 60.

understand the true character of the office in the Empire period. It will be shown that even an office of prestige cannot be divorced from the strongly rooted feeling that, if possible, every tribe should have a representative in the course of a tribal cycle.

The truth of this is apparent in the case of the archons of the first century B. C., even after the constitution of Athens was changed. One of the striking things that meets the phyle-minded eye is not the discarding of tribal cycles in the archonship but the substitution of tribal cycles in the allotment order throughout the first century B. C. *I. G.*, II², 2336 (102/1-96/5),¹⁰ which gives both horizontally and longitudinally an almost complete list of all the nine archons with their demotics, shows (1) that longitudinally the eponymous archonship for these years is in the tribal allotment order; (2) that both longitudinally and horizontally the three senior archonships were distributed by allotment among the tribes; (3) that the thesmothetai, with one exception due to a clerical error, follow Beloch's law¹¹ and are distributed in the official order. It is obvious that the allotment order continues into the Empire period, for *I. G.*, II², 1721 (14/3) shows perfect horizontal distribution in the case of the three senior archons and the maintenance of the official order for the thesmothetai. Similarly the sortition cycles in the longitudinal order observed in 102/1-96/5 apparently continue, for Kointos, archon for 56/5 (*I. G.*, II², 1717) comes from Aiantis (X), Polyainos, archon for 14/3 (*I. G.*, II², 1721) comes from Attalis (XII), and Xenon, archon *ca.* 8 (*I. G.*, II², 1722) comes from Ptolemais (V). Thus we have evidence, which will be later supplemented, that the archonship was distributed according to the allotment order among the tribes from the beginning of the first century and continued into the early Empire period.

The origin of the allotment order in the archonship is to be found perhaps in the increase of the number of tribes from ten to twelve. The problem did not arise when there were ten tribes, for the nine archons plus the secretary of the thesmothetai¹²

¹⁰ Cf. table in Ferguson, *Athenian Tribal Cycles in the Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), p. 51; Dow, *Hesperia*, III (1934), p. 177.

¹¹ Cf. *Jahrb. d. Class. Phil.* (Fleckeisen, 1884), pp. 481 ff.; cf. Ferguson, *Tribal Cycles*, pp. 52-4.

¹² Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 55, 1.

solved the problem of equal representation from all tribes and thus the official order was used. When the tribes, however, were increased to twelve and later to thirteen a difficult problem arose of adjusting the disproportionate number of archons to the tribes. The official order would leave two (or three) tribes unrepresented. Kahrstedt suggests that the problem was solved in the case of twelve tribes by having the priest of Asclepius and the herald of the Areopagus come from the two unrepresented tribes.¹³ Ferguson in his review of Kahrstedt's *Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen* has shown that the case of Phyleus of Eleusis in 286/5 forms no basis for believing that "the archontic role was permanently attached to the priesthood of Asklepios." Similarly, the presence of the Herald of the Areopagus with the nine archons in post-Sullan and Empire period lists has "no relevance for Hellenistic times," and records "some unknown post-Sullan act or grouping."¹⁴ Therefore the problem that presented itself to the Athenians upon the creation of Antigonis and Demetrias was whether to create two additional archonships if the official order was to be kept or else to keep the traditional number of archons and find another mechanism of choosing archons which would not run counter to the strongly-rooted feeling that every tribe should have a representative on a composite board. This mechanism was found in the sortition cycle already in use in choosing prytanies. The sortition cycle must have appeared to the Athenians as the best compromise which would preserve the traditional number of archons and at the same time not offend any particular tribe. The use of the lot to select nine archons and one secretary of the thesmothetai out of the twelve tribes must have seemed as fair to the Athenians as the toss of a coin seems to us in case of equal claims. The unrepresented tribes would thus not feel slighted, as would have been the case if the official order were kept. The sortition cycle, being a mechanism which assured distributive justice¹⁵ in a case where the number of archons was disproportionate to

¹³ U. Kahrstedt, *Untersuchungen zur Magistratur in Athen—Studien zum öffentlichen Recht Athens*, Teil II (Stuttgart, 1936), pp. 26-7.

¹⁴ Ferguson, *A.J.P.*, LIX (1938), pp. 233-4; for Ferguson's own view of the problem cf. *Tribal Cycles*, p. 52, n. 1; cf. also Dow, *Hesperia*, III (1934), pp. 184-5.

¹⁵ For the conception of distributive justice in awarding of honors by the state cf. Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.*, 1130 b 30-33; *Politics*, 1317 b.

the number of tribes, was chosen as the way out of the dilemma to the satisfaction of the tribes.¹⁶ But the sortition cycle did not entirely supplant the official order in the composite board of archons. The spirit of compromise is shown in the fact that the allotment order was grafted to the official order in the board of archons; the three senior archons were chosen on the basis of the allotment order while the six thesmothetai were chosen on the basis of the official order from the residuum.¹⁷

The composite board of archons from 229/8-213/2 (*I. G.*, II², 1706) and 102/1-96/5 (*I. G.*, II², 2336) shows that the principle of choosing the senior archons by allotment order must have been applied both horizontally and perpendicularly at the same time. Outside of these lists we do not possess sufficient demotics in the eponymous archonship in the Hellenistic period to determine the exact date when the principle of sortition cycles was first applied. But the fact that Ferguson has shown a new sortition cycle to have begun with the creation of Ptolemais (224/3-223/2)¹⁸ shows that the earlier archons in *I. G.*, II², 1706 were chosen on the basis of sortition cycles even before this. The exact point might be located in 307/6, the date of the creation of Antigonis and Demetrias, when the problem first arose whether to create additional archons or to distribute the three senior archonships by lot among the twelve tribes. Now, if we use *I. G.*, II², 1706 (229/8-213/2), *I. G.*, II², 2336 (102/1-96/5), *I. G.*, II², 1717 (56/5), *I. G.*, II², 1721 (14/3), and *I. G.*, II², 1722 (*ca.* 8), as *points d'appui*, we find that the allotment order was used both horizontally and perpendicularly in the case of the three senior archons throughout the Hellenistic period and extending to the early Empire period. We have thus reached a basic principle to guide us in eliciting the method of choosing archons at the beginning of the Empire period.

A closer examination, however, of all the archon lists of the first century B. C. will reveal some significant exceptions to

¹⁶ The possession in Athens as late as 157 B. C. of a stock of allotment machines in marble is of relevance to this point. Cf. Dow, *Prytaneis* (*Hesperia*, Supplement I [Athens, 1937]), pp. 198 ff.

¹⁷ Cf. Ferguson, *Tribal Cycles*, pp. 50-4; Dow, *Hesperia*, III (1934), pp. 178-81.

¹⁸ Ferguson, *Tribal Cycles*, p. 53; for the date of the creation of Ptolemais cf. W. Kendrick Pritchett, *The Five Attic Tribes After Kleisthenes* (Baltimore, 1943), pp. 13-23.

this general principle. *I. G.*, II², 2336 (102/1-96/5) and *I. G.*, II², 1721 (14/3) show a perfect horizontal distribution among the tribes, allotment order for the three senior archons, and the official order for the thesmothetai. Yet we have evidence that the perfect tribal distribution which is shown in these two inscriptions is not absolutely maintained in other inscriptions of the period. Along with these inscriptions we have others which show that, though the principle of the allotment order is maintained in the distribution of the archons throughout the tribes, exceptions appear in which a single tribe is represented by two archons.¹⁹ This is important, for here we have the nucleus for the extension of this exception from the horizontal to the longitudinal order in the cycles of tribal distribution. Later in the Empire period we shall find one tribe holding two or sometimes more archonships within a longitudinal cycle in the allotment order. As evidence for a single tribe being represented by two archons in one year we have *I. G.*, II², 1714 (ca. 90, Ferguson; 88/7, Dow), *I. G.*, II², 1715 (85/4?), *I. G.*, II², 1717 (56/5), *I. G.*, II², 1719 (46/5), *I. G.*, II², 1722 (ca. 8 B. C.), *I. G.*, II², 1729 (ca. 1 B. C.). Although, as Dow points out,²⁰ some of these duplications may be avoided by either assuming clerical errors in the lists or conjecturing that a deme was subdivided, there is no doubt that after the suppression of the Demos in 91 B. C. the rule that no two archons should come from the same tribe was from time to time relaxed. The tribal system is tampered with and changed slowly but not uprooted suddenly. The archonship may or may not have become an elective office, but it cannot be abstracted from the strongly ingrained tribal distribution of the office. This office can be elective like that of the strategoi and still be distributed among the tribes *κατὰ φυλὰς* even when they were elected as *ἐξ ἀπάντων*.²¹ The evidence shows that Athens still adhered to its deeply rooted ancestral political machinery while making it elastic to fit political, social, and economic conditions and circumstances. Thus the question is not whether we shall abandon the tribal

¹⁹ For a list of these see the inscriptions marked with † in the tables of Ferguson (*Tribal Cycles*, pp. 50-1) and Dow (*Hesperia*, III [1934], pp. 177-9).

²⁰ Dow, *Hesperia*, III (1934), pp. 180-1.

²¹ Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.*, 61; cf. Ferguson, *A. J. P.*, LIX (1938), pp. 232-3.

order with respect to the archonship but rather the degree in which the deeply ingrained tribal system is maintained or tampered with.²² It is the aim of this paper to show that the method of choosing archons in the Empire period is the result of two forces at work in Athens: (1) a deeply rooted adherence to the ancestral political machinery and (2) the adaptation of this machinery to pay Athens' respects to Roman aristocracy and distinguished Athenians who had acquired Roman citizenship.²³

This conclusion is based not only on the above-mentioned inscriptions where both a perpendicular and horizontal tribal allotment order is evident but also on a study of the archon eponymous list from 113/4-169/70 A.D. A close scrutiny of this list in the light of Ferguson's sortition cycles gives us an indication of the method employed, if not for the entire Empire period at least for a considerable period in the second century after Hadrianis was created. It is fortunate that the majority of archons in this period can be dated exactly or approximately (a) by inscriptions which mention the year of Hadrian's visit to Athens, (b) by the Delian lists containing consecutive archons, and (c) by the year of the paedotribia of Abascantus which fixes the position of many archons.²⁴

An analysis of the archon list from 113/4-169/70, as found in the Kirchner-Kolbe table recently revised by Oliver²⁵ with some corrections, further determinations, and additional archons, shows the following interesting facts.

If we abstract from this list Tib. Claudius Attalos (140/1 or 141/2), the historian Arrian (145/6), P. Aelius Vibullius (143/4) belonging to the stemma of Herodes Atticus, Praxa-

²² For the various discussions of the gradual breakdown of the tribal system in Athens, cf. references cited by Dow, *Hesperia*, III (1934), p. 181, n. 2.

²³ Cf. Oliver, *Hesperia*, XI (1942), pp. 29-30; A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford, 1939), pp. 190-1, 203-4.

²⁴ Cf. Testimonia in the Kirchner-Kolbe table, *I. G.*, II², Pars Altera, Fasciculus posterior (1931), pp. 792-4. For additional relevant remarks as to the differences between the Kirchner-Kolbe table and those of Graindor, cf. Oliver, *Hesperia*, XI (1942), p. 81. The evidence from the secretary cycles shows that the year of Abascantus can definitely be assigned to 136/7, the date assigned to him by Kolbe on independent grounds: cf. Notopoulos, *A. J. P.*, LXIV (1943), p. 55, n. 31.

²⁵ Oliver, *Hesperia*, XI (1942), pp. 81-9.

goras II (154/5), the following archons who belong to the Diokles stemma: P. Aelius Alexandros I (142/3), Aelius Ardys (150/1), Aelius Kallikrates (156/7), and Aelius Alexandros II (159/60), and Philisteides (163/4), all the remaining archons from 113/4-163/4 would form four sortition cycles. Using 125/6, the first archon year after the creation of Hadrianis, probably in March 125,²⁶ as the point of a cycle demarcation, we would get one twelve-tribe sortition cycle (113/4-124/5), and three thirteen-tribe sortition cycles (125/6-137/8, 138/9-150/1, 151/2-163/4).

The first cycle (113/4-124/5) consists of eleven archons, four of whom have demotics. As far as the evidence of demotics shows, no tribe holds the archonship twice. It is of interest to note that the end of the cycle coincides with a hypothetical prytany-secretary from Attalis, the twelfth tribe in the official order. The prytany-secretary in the year of T. Κωπώνιος Ἀγνούσιος, who has been securely dated by Kolbe in 117/8,²⁷ is Νευκίας Δωρίωνος Φλευεύς (Ptolemais V). If we rotate forward from this point we find that the twelfth tribe holds the office in 124/5; a new cycle would then begin in September, 125/6, for Hadrianis was in the process of organization in the winter and spring of 125; thus the archon who assumed office in Sept. 124, the month of Hadrian's arrival at Athens, would not go out of office until Sept. 125. The new secretary cycle would then coincide with the beginning of a cycle marked by the creation of Hadrianis. The coincidence of Hadrian's arrival in Athens with the completion of a prytany-secretary tribal cycle would thus facilitate the creation of a new tribe.

The second cycle (125/6-137/8) consists of seven archons all of whom except one possess the demotic. No tribe holds the archonship twice; this sortition cycle is an interesting indication of the refreshed tribal consciousness that resulted from the creation of a new tribe. The archaizing spirit of the Hadrianic era is also revealed in the strict observance of the official order in the prytany-secretaryship. Hadrianis, now enrolled as seventh

²⁶ W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus* (Leipzig, 1907), p. 163; cf. Graindor, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-22; Graindor, *Athènes sous Hadrien* (Cairo, 1934), pp. 18 ff.

²⁷ W. Kolbe, "Studien zur attischen Chronologie der Kaiserzeit," *Ath. Mitt.*, XLVI (1921), p. 108.

in the official order, falls upon rotation from 117/8 (Ptolemais V) in 131/2, the seventh year after the creation of Hadrianis. The fact that the archon as well as the prytany-secretary for 131/2 comes from Hadrianis is indicative of a deliberate effort on the part of the Athenians to honor the official inauguration of Hadrianis. Though Hadrianis could have been honored with an archon in 125/6, immediately upon its creation, this concession would run counter to the archaizing spirit of the time which would feel that this honor should be reserved for 131/2, the year when Hadrianis first took its place as the seventh tribe in the official order. It is also significant to observe that the archon for 131/2 is chosen on the basis of the official order whereas the remaining archons in the cycle were chosen on the basis of the allotment order. This can only be explained as a deliberate effort on the part of the Athenians to honor the induction of Hadrianis to the official order.

The third cycle (138/9-150/1) consists of twelve archons, all but one of whom have demotics.²⁸ Aiantis holds the archonship four times. The fourth cycle (151/2-163/4) consists of ten archons all of whom possess demotics. Aiantis holds the archonship three times in this cycle. The last two cycles show that Aiantis holds a preëminent position among the tribes. The feeling that every tribe should be represented in office, a characteristic of Athenian democracy, has waned somewhat since the creation of Hadrianis and with this ebb in the archaizing spirit the archonship is again distributed, as was bound to be the case in Athens in the Empire period, in a ratio of merit and rank and prestige rather than equality among the tribes.

This analysis has shown that of the forty archons whose names we possess for the period 113/4-163/4, thirty-one archons possess demotics. The nine archons who spoil the perfect formation of sortition cycles in this period are distributed as follows among the tribes: one comes from Pandionis, one from Hippothontis, one from Kekropis, one from Akamantis, and five come from Aiantis. The remaining twenty-two archons are distributed in the various cycles among the tribes in the allotment order. Thus there is with the exception of Aiantis a relatively wide distribution of the office among the tribes during this period. The possibility of four sortition cycles, if we abstract the above-

²⁸ The third cycle contains in addition one demotic without an archon.

mentioned archons, shows that the distribution of the office is not accidental and is proof of the existence of a strong tribal consciousness in Athens in the Empire period.

If we examine the prosopography of the archons who spoil the formation of these sortition cycles we find that they are distinguished persons. Arrian,²⁹ though a native of Nicomedia, became a citizen of Athens after an active military and administrative career in Cappadocia. In Athens he added to his laurels with his public spirit, wealth, and talent as a historian and geographer. The Athenians honored this distinguished Atticist by making him archon in 145/6. P. Aelius Vibullius (143/4)³⁰ comes from the illustrious family of Herodes Atticus and the celebrated deme of Marathon of the tribe Aiantis; his father was archon in 118/9, an honor quite to be expected in the Herodes stemma. P. Aelius Alexandros I (142/3), Aelius Ardys (150/1), Aelius Kallikrates (156/7), and Aelius Alexandros II (159/60) are members of the illustrious stemma of Diokles and all come from the deme Phaleron of the tribe Aiantis. The index of the prestige of this family may be seen in the fact that nine out of the eleven male members of this stemma held the archonship, five times within the twenty-year interval of 142/3-162/3. From the inscription³¹ which establishes the stemma we find that these archons have a distinguished career. Aelius Ardys has been ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν Σεβαστῶν, priest of Dionysos Eleuthereus, herald for the second time, agonothetes of the Olympieia, strategos. Aelius Kallikrates has been strategos, herald, agonothetes. The other archons of the same stemma are equally distinguished. Aelius Gelos II has been herald of the Areopagus. His paternal uncle Aelius Gelos I was strategos, πρῶτος ἐνστάρχης, priest of Zeus Olympios; his daughter, Aelia Epilampsis, in whose honor the inscription is set up, was priestess of Demeter and Kore. Later on the family furnished P. Pomp. Hegias I and II, both of whom became archons and held honorific titles. It is evident that the family was proud of its record for we find all its distinctions enumerated in a single inscription. Likewise Praxagoras II belongs to an illustrious family descended from Leonides of Melite. This stemma³² replete with honors includes

²⁹ Cf. Graindor, *op. cit.*, no. 110.

³⁰ For stemma cf. *I. G.*, II², 3594-5, n.

³¹ *I. G.*, II², 3687 and n.

³² *I. G.*, II², 3609 and n.

five archonships. The records of the two remaining archons, Tib. Claudius Attalos and Philisteides, are not so full as the other archons but they no doubt belong to the same category of honor, for the former is mentioned in a Delian inscription and the latter is followed later in the archonship by his son.³³ The prosopographia of all these archons leaves no doubt that the archons who spoil the perfect formation of sortition cycles can be accounted for as members of illustrious families; many of them came from Aiantis and hold the archonship as a traditional family honor. The fact that, out of thirty-four archons with demotics in the period 113/4-169/70, eleven came from Aiantis, and in particular that five members of the Diokles stemma held the archonship five times within twenty years sufficiently explains the exceptions to the rule of sortition cycles in the archonship during this period.

We may conclude from this examination of the archon list from 113/4 to 163/4 that the archons during this period were chosen with (a) a view to tribal distribution of the office and (b) a disregard of tribal distribution in the case of distinguished persons. This method or principle which guided the choice of archons is clearly brought out in a period where we have the nearest approach to exact dating in the entire Empire period.

This method of choosing archons is the result of syncretism. Rome had not disturbed the local tribal mechanism of Athens;³⁴ yet this tribal mechanism, the logical expression of the democratic principle that every tribe should have a representative in the various offices of the state, could hardly function in the same manner in the Athens of the Empire period as it did in the Athens of the pre-Sullan period. The basis of democracy is equality whereas that of aristocracy is wealth, noble birth, prestige. We know that an oligarchical régime was established and supported by the Romans³⁵ and therefore we can expect some modification in the tribal machinery when the prestige of aristocracy is substituted for the equality of democracy in Athens under the Empire. It is obvious, therefore, that the lot, the logical expression of democracy, could not apply to the archon-

³³ Cf. Graindor, *op. cit.*, nos. 114, 125.

³⁴ Cf. Ferguson, *Tribal Cycles*, p. 155.

³⁵ B. Keil, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Areopags* (Leipzig, 1920), pp. 27, 86-7; M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, 1941), p. 939.

ship in this period. This is evident from the fact that prior to 91 B. C. the eponymous archonship is held by inconspicuous people, whereas in the Empire period it is held by a relatively high percentage of distinguished persons, though we must not assume that every archon was in the same category as some members of distinguished stemmata. It is inconceivable that the lot should have hit upon so many distinguished people, Roman emperors, foreign princes.³⁶ Therefore we must assume that the lot was replaced at some time by election in the archonship. The exact date of the change is not known, for Graindor's date of 103/2, based on the assumption that Ferguson's law no longer holds after this date, has nothing to commend it. The date of the change must be coördinated, however, with the establishment of the Areopagus as the most important political body in Athens and related to certain changes that took place with respect to the coöption of the ex-archons by the Areopagus. Keil in his study of the Areopagus at this period has shown that in ten cases, in inscriptions dated from the middle of the first century B. C. on, the herald of the Areopagus had for the most part held previously the office of ἀρχων ἐπώνυμος and in one case that of ἀρχων βασιλεύς. He concludes therefore that only these two archons passed into the Areopagus, not automatically but by coöption.³⁷ This change would prevent the Areopagus from becoming too unwieldy through too large a membership as would have been the case if all the nine archons became members. It follows therefore that the change of method in choosing archons must be related to the change that took place in the coöption of archons to the Areopagus.

Yet, as shown in the case of strategoi in democratic Athens, χειροτονία need not be divorced from the strongly ingrained tribal feeling which accompanied it.³⁸ From the lists of the strategoi³⁹ which Beloch and Accame have collected we see that representation of the ten tribes in the college of strategoi remains

³⁶ Cf. Oliver, *Hesperia*, XI (1942), p. 60.

³⁷ Keil, *op. cit.*, pp. 82-7, 92.

³⁸ Cf. Ferguson, *A. J. P.*, LIX (1938), p. 233; Kahrstedt, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-9.

³⁹ K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte* (Strassburg, 1912-16), II², pp. 260 ff.; Accame, *Riv. Fil.*, 1935, pp. 342 ff.; cf. F. W. Lenz, "The Athenian Strategoi of the Years 441/40 and 433/32," *T. A. P. A.*, LXXII (1941), pp. 226-32.

the rule but exceptions to the rule must be explained by an extraordinary person in the state like Pericles or by circumstances which we cannot appreciate. Here we have a precedent for the use of a method which aimed at tribal distribution of an office yet disregard of this principle in the case of distinguished persons. Perhaps another might be found in the fact that on occasions, as pointed out by Ferguson, "all candidates for the archonship withdrew in favor of the one whose name, or dignity, or patronage made his election desirable."⁴⁰ In the Empire this principle might be extended, *mutatis mutandis*, from the individual to the tribe and one tribe could withdraw in favor of another tribe, whose candidate's election was desirable on account of dignity or patronage.

If this method of choosing archons shown in the inscriptions of the first century B. C. is applicable to the Empire, it is evident that the archons like the earlier strategoi or prytany-secretaries were chosen *κατὰ φυλὰς*. This hypothesis finds some corroboration in the sortition cycle before and after the creation of Hadrianis. Yet even if the archon eponymous was chosen *ἐξ ἀπάντων* the situation would not be changed as far as tribal distribution is concerned. As Ferguson has pointed out, "Since in Athens the phyle was the active constituent or competitive unit in administration, war, athletic and musical contests, it cannot have failed to assert itself in politics. Hence it accords with the realities of political life that officials should be chosen largely *κατὰ φυλὰς* even when as in the case of the strategoi they were elected as *ἐξ ἀπάντων* (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 61)."⁴¹ The tribe therefore must be reckoned as the basic unit regardless of the specific method of choosing archons. The large number of the demotics of the archon eponymous is irrefutable evidence of the tribal consciousness in the Empire period. The tribe should have equality of opportunity in holding the honorific office of the eponymous archonship if it could afford it. The sortition cycle would theoretically assure equality in the share of the office. Yet for practical and material reasons the tribes may not all have been equal in wealth, prestige, or number of illustrious families. The office involved a financial burden and, as the number of

⁴⁰ Ferguson, *Tribal Cycles*, p. 178.

⁴¹ Ferguson, *A. J. P.*, LIX (1938), pp. 232-3.

ἀναρχία shows, it was not always possible to find a candidate.⁴² It is natural, therefore, to believe that the archonship should be theoretically available to every tribe within a cycle, yet find that only those tribes which had available or willing candidates could furnish the archon. This would account for the prominence of Aiantis in the tenure of the archonship. Each tribe would thus have an opportunity to furnish an archon within the sortition cycle yet pass up the opportunity in favor of another tribe which by furnishing a candidate increased its prestige and position with the Romans.

This *de iure* and *de facto* distribution of the archonship among the tribes is well illustrated in the case of the four sortition cycles. When tribal consciousness is high, as after the creation of Hadrianis, we have, as far as the evidence goes, a perfect sortition cycle. In the last two cycles there is still tribal distribution but instead of distribution *κατ' ἰσότητα*, the basis of democracy, we have distribution among the tribes *κατ' ἀναλογίαν* of merit, wealth, and noble birth which constitute the basis of aristocracy. Dow's tables⁴³ of the relative distribution of the archonship among the various demes and tribes aptly illustrate this principle in the method of choosing archons in the Empire period. The pre-eminence of Aiantis is striking.⁴⁴ Out of 93 archons with demotics 27 come from Aiantis, with Pandionis next with 14, then Aigeis, Kekropis, and Akamantis each with 7. Likewise Aiantis leads in the number of archons who came from prominent demes of Attica. Marathon and Phaleron head the list with 16 and 10 archons respectively. The prominence of Marathon may be due to the fact that it was the chosen deme of illustrious Romans who became citizens of Athens and conversely illustrious Athenians who won Roman citizenship. It is the deme of Herodes Atticus and the Diokles stemma which together held the eponymous archonship 13 times. It is possible that the fame of Marathon in Greek history may account for its attraction in Atticizing Romans. Thus we see that the method of choosing archons in the Empire is the result of an Athens which was

⁴² P. Graindor, *Athènes de Tibère à Trajan* (Cairo, 1931), pp. 19, n. 2 and 72 ff.; cf. Dow, *Hesperia*, III (1934), p. 146; Oliver, *Hesperia*, II (1933), p. 510.

⁴³ Dow, *Hesperia*, III (1934), p. 182.

⁴⁴ For the prominence of Aiantis before the Empire period cf. Ferguson, *Tribal Cycles*, pp. 78-80.

trying to combine deference to imperial aristocracy with maintenance of local ancestral machinery.

Unfortunately the chronology of the period prior and posterior to the list examined does not offer the same precision. An attempt ⁴⁵ to carry sortition cycles in the period prior to 113/4 shows evidence of tribal distribution though the demotic is scarce. An attempt to carry forward sortition cycles after 163/4 shows a great preponderance of archons from the demes of Marathon and Phaleron and from Melite. In the cycle from 164/5 to 176/7 we have two *ἀναρχία*, two archons from Aiantis, two from Kekropis, and three from individual tribes; in the cycle from 177/8 to 189/90 we have one *ἀναρχία*, three archons from Aiantis, two from Hadrianis, and three from individual tribes; in the cycle from 190/1 to 202/3 we have one *ἀναρχία*, three archons from Aiantis, two from Antiochis, two from Hippothontis, two from Pandionis, and two from individual tribes; in the cycle from 203/4 to 215/6 we have six archons from Aiantis, three from Erechtheis, and one from Oineis. Further cycles cannot be sketched because of lack of evidence. The one case of a repeated tenure of the archonship which occurs after Gallienus may serve as terminus for sortition cycles, for it is likely that in Gallienus' time a reorganization of the Athenian Constitution may have taken place.⁴⁶

Again these sortition cycles reveal the extent to which archons were elected for tribal distribution and the extent to which that principle was disregarded. They also focus our attention on the tribe Aiantis, which has marked precedence over other tribes in the tenure of the office. On the basis of our evidence we see that between 113/4 and 137/8, two sortition cycles, Aiantis holds the archonship twice; between 203/4 and 215/6, it holds it six times. From this we may infer that the balance between the principle of tribal distribution and the disregard of it in favor of Aiantis varies from period to period.

A study of the archon lists of the Empire period has shown that local institutions change slowly and in changing adapt themselves to new conditions. Tribal distribution, the deeply ingrained mechanism of distributing offices and honors in de-

⁴⁵ In this I have used the approximate chronological table of Graindor, *op. cit.*, pp. 296-9.

⁴⁶ Cf. Graindor, *Marbres*, p. 78.

TABLE OF ARCHONS
(113/4-163/4 A. D.)

Year	Archon	Demotic	Tribe	Undated Archons Within Cycle	Year
THE FIRST CYCLE					
113/4	Octavius Theon				138/9
114/5	Octavius Proclus				
115/6					139/4
116/7	Flavius Macrinus	Acharneus	Oineis VII		
117/8	T. Coponius Maximus	Hagnousios	Attalis XII		
118/9	L. Vibullius Hipparchos	Marathonios	Aiantis X		140/1
119/20	Flavius Stratolaos				141/2
120/1	Claudius Demophilos				142/3
121/2	Flavius Sophokles				143/4
122/3	T. Flavius Alkibiades I	Paianieus	Pandionis III		144/5
123/4	Cassius Diogenes				145/6
124/5	Flavius Euphanes				146/7
THE SECOND CYCLE					
125/6	C. Julius Cassius	Steirieus	Pandionis III	Tib. Cl. Lysiades, Meliteus, Ke- kropis IX	147/8
126/7	Tib. Claudius Herodes	Marathonios	Aiantis XI		148/9
127/8	Memmius ros	Kollyteus	Aigeis II		149/5
128/9	Claudius Domitianus				150/1
129/30					
130/1					
131/2	Claudius Philogenes	Besaieus	Hadrianis VII		151/2
132/3	Sallustianus	Phlyeus	Ptolemais V		152/3
133/4					153/4
134/5					154/5
135/6					155/6
136/7					156/7
137/8					157/8
					158/9
					159/6
					160/1
					161/2
					162/3
					163/4

TABLE OF ARCHONS—Continued.
(113/4–163/4 A. D.)

Year	Archon	Demotic	Tribe	Undated Archons Within Cycle
THE THIRD CYCLE				
138/9	Praxagoras (I) ὁ καὶ Τειμόθεος	Thorikios	Akamantis VI	D. Junius Patron, Berenikides, Ptolemais V
139/40	T. Flavius Alkibiades II	Paanieus	Pandionis III	L. Nummius Me- nis, Phalereus, Aiantis XI
140/1	Tib. Claudius Attalos	Sphettios	Akamantis VI	
141/2	P. Aelius Phileas	Meliteus	Kekropis IX	
142/3	P. Aelius Alexandros (I)	(Phalereus)	Aiantis XI	
143/4	P. Aelius Vibullius Rufus	(Marathonios)	Aiantis XI	
144/5				
145/6	Flavius Arrianus	Paanieus	Pandionis III	
146/7	Ti (— —	Euony)meus	Erechtheis I	
147/8	Syllas			
148/9	— — —	Hestiaiothen	Aigeis II	
149/50				
150/1	Aelius Ardys	(Phalereus)	Aiantis XI	
THE FOURTH CYCLE				
151/2				Tib. Claud. Demonstratos, Meliteus, Kekropis IX
152/3				
153/4				
154/5	Praxagoras II	Meliteus	Kekropis IX	
155/6	Popillius Theotimos	Sounieus	Attalis XIII	
156/7	Aelius Kallikrates	(Phalereus)	Aiantis XI	
157/8				
158/9	T. Aurelius Philemon	Philades	Aigeis II	
159/60	P. Aelius Alexandros (II)	(Phalereus)	Aiantis XI	
160/1	P. Aelius Hellen	Azenieus	Hippothontis X	
161/2	L. Memmius	Thorikios	Akamantis VI	
162/3	Aelius Gelos	Phalereus	Aiantis XI	
163/4	Philisteides	Peiraeus	Hippothontis X	

mocracy, still continues in the Empire period, but not without undergoing modifications imposed by the exigencies of an aristocratic Athens. The fact that the office was a financial burden, a stepping stone to the Areopagus, the most important political body in Athens in the Empire, made it inevitable that the democratic principle in the distribution of the office could hardly survive in imperial Athens. A compromise resulted between the democratic principle of the allotment order and the aristocratic gravitation to distinction, wealth, prestige as qualifications for the archonship. This compromise could hardly be avoided in Athens where the phylai though theoretically equal differed in prestige and constituent wealthy families. We notice successive stages in the breakdown of the tribal system of distributing the archonship. In the first century B. C. we find the archonship distributed on the basis of the allotment rather than the official order. Exception to the rule that no tribe should hold the archonship more than once in its turn makes its appearance after 92/1 in the horizontal order. Then it spreads to the longitudinal order of the cycles where it becomes the exception rather than the rule. The relation of the rule to the exception varies from time to time; a study of the archons in the period of 113/4-163/4 shows that in a short period after the creation of Hadrianis the rule prevails. This may be due to the archaizing spirit of the time and a tribal consciousness refreshed by the addition of a new tribe; then the rule gradually gives way to exceptions, particularly in the case of Aiantis, until the exception becomes the rule and allotment becomes a mere phrase. Such is the inevitable result of syncretism—the syncretism of an Athens adhering to its political machinery while adapting it to pay its respects to imperial aristocracy.

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS.

TRINITY COLLEGE.

CICERO'S GREEK TEXT OF HERODOTUS, I, 31.

As is well known, Cicero quotes in the *Tusculan Disputations*, *Herodoto auctore*, the story of Cleobis and Biton as a part of his argument that death is not an evil. Although in general his account is considerably condensed, it seems to show in one place a curious expansion of Herodotus' words as they appear in our Greek text. Here are the two versions:

οἱ δὲ βόες ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ οὐ παρεγένοντο ἐν ὥρῃ. ἐκκληιόμενοι [ἐκκληιζόμενοι codd. dett.] δὲ τῇ ὥρῃ οἱ νεανίαι ὑποδύντες αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τὴν ζεύγλῃν εἴλκον τὴν ἄμαξαν· ἐπὶ τῆς ἀμάξης δὲ ὥχέετο ἡ μήτηρ . . . (Herodotus, I, 31).

cum . . . morarenturque iumenta, tum iuvenes ii quos nominavi veste posita corpora oleo perunxerunt, ad iugum accesserunt. Ita sacerdos advecta in fanum cum currus esset ductus a filiis . . . (Cicero, *Disp. Tusc.*, I, 47).

With all due allowance for the differences of idiom and for the obvious lack of literalness in translation, one may still note the following significant points.

1) There is nothing in Cicero's version to correspond with ἐκκληιόμενοι δὲ τῇ ὥρῃ. This is not surprising. The phrase is peculiar¹ and in its present form certainly is not important to the story. It may, however, represent some other reading in Cicero's own Greek text.

2) Two details elsewhere unattested appear in Cicero's version—the laying aside of their clothing by the young men and their anointing themselves with oil. These are not variations in language but entirely separate and new ideas.

3) The Herodotean phrase ὑποδύντες ὑπὸ τὴν ζεύγλῃν appears to be rendered rather inadequately as *ad iugum accesserunt*. One would expect at least *sub iugum subierunt*.²

The apparently unsupported expansion of the story long ago attracted the attention of two well-known scholars, Bouhier and

¹ The closest parallel which I have seen is Latin, not Greek, i. e., Caesar, *B. G.*, VII, 9, *diei tempore exclusus*. Moreover, Servius in his version of the story (*ad Georg.*, III, 532) says that the oxen had all died of the plague, so that "prevented by the [lateness of] the hour [from waiting further]" is hardly appropriate.

² Servius, *loc. cit.*, has *subeuntes iugum*, thus showing that by his time (s. IV) the Greek text agreed with ours in this detail.

Valckenaer.³ The former, in order to account for Cicero's *corpora oleo perunxerunt* proposed to emend ἐκκληγόμενοι to ἐξελαιούμενοι. The latter, with Cicero's *veste posita* in mind, would emend the same word to ἐκδύμενοι. But neither could account for the presence of both details. It has occurred to the present writer that a somewhat different approach may lead not only to a solution of both difficulties but also to an interesting indication of the state of the Herodotus text in Cicero's time.

The most obvious Greek equivalent for *veste posita* is ἀποδύντες which commonly appears with this intransitive sense in the second aorist active form.⁴ May we not assume that Cicero's Greek text read ἀποδύντες instead of ὑποδύντες? But if this is true, the phrase ὑπὸ τὴν ζεύγλην is left without connection. Presumably then Cicero's *accesserunt ad iugum* must represent something like ἐπὶ τὴν ζεύγλην ἐπῆλθον.⁵ The loss of this last word immediately before the somewhat similar εἶλκον of our text would be an easy palaeographical error. It may be noted that ἐπῆλθον, though the etymological equivalent of *accesserunt*, expresses better the sense of "approach with the intent to do something."

Though Bouhier's suggestion that the source of the phrase *corpora oleo perunxerunt* is to be sought in the ἐκκληγόμενοι of our text seems quite sound, his ἐξελαιούμενοι is open to objection. The word is not Herodotean and is apparently quite late.⁶ Also it seems to mean "become oily" and not "anoint." ἐξαηλιμμένοι, on the other hand, is a close equivalent of the intensive *perunxerunt*, and the compound is attested in Herodotus with the sense required here.⁷ Therefore, in spite of the fact that it is somewhat further removed palaeographically from the preserved reading than Bouhier's form, it seems preferable.

Since ἐξαλείφω is used by Herodotus with a dative of means, and since Cicero specifically mentions *oleo*, one may conjecture

³ Their views are cited most conveniently in Larcher's *Notes on Herodotus* (London, 1829), I, pp. 48 f.

⁴ Cf. e.g., Thucydides, I, 6, 3: ἀποδύντες λίπα . . . ἡλείψαντο. Herodotus himself uses this verb twice (V, 92 η) but only in the transitive first aorist form.

⁵ A striking parallel to this passage is Aristophanes, *Acharn.*, 627: ἀποδύντες τοῖς ἀναπαλστοῖς ἐπίλωμεν.

⁶ The only citation in LSJ of this verb in the middle sense is from Theophrastus and applies to plants.

⁷ VII, 69, 1: τοῦ δὲ σώματος τὸ μὲν ἡμισυ ἐξηλείφοντο γύψω . . .

that when the sense of the participle was lost, τῇ ὥρῃ suggested by the ἐν ὥρῃ which immediately precedes, was substituted for an original ἐλαίῳ.

One further point remains. Logic demands that the young men strip before they anoint themselves with oil, and this is the order of narration by Cicero. In other words, the ἀποδύντες must have preceded the ἐξαληλιμμένοι. Any categorical explanation of its transfer to its present position before αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τὴν ζεύγλῃν cannot of course be made. It seems possible, however, that the process began with the loss of ἐπῆλθον (Cicero's *accesse-runt*), as a result of which the ἀποδύντες in the form ὑποδύντες was drawn into position before ἐπὶ (ὑπὸ) τὴν ζεύγλῃν. This would leave the ἐξαληλιμμένοι exposed to misinterpretation and adaptation to its present form under the influence of the preceding clause.

We may then tentatively reconstruct the Greek text which Cicero read as follows:

οἱ δὲ βόες ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ οὐ παρεγένοντο ἐν ὥρῃ· ἀποδύντες δὲ καὶ ἐξαληλιμμένοι ἐλαίῳ οἱ νεανῖαι αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ζεύγλῃν ἐπῆλθον καὶ εἰλκον τὴν ἄμαξαν . . .

Obviously this reconstruction is hypothetical, and one would hesitate to claim that it represents the original form from which the reading of the existing MS tradition had deteriorated. Nevertheless it does explain logically the peculiarities of the Ciceronian version and at the same time makes room for the Servian detail of the death of the oxen. It seems just possible that Cicero may have consulted in his library one of the variant traditions of Herodotus, of the sort which has become familiar to us in recent years from the papyri. Standardization of texts in the modern sense was far from being realized in the first century B. C., and we are still too much inclined to neglect the implications of the significant dictum made by the physician Galen two centuries after Cicero's time: "While it is rash to alter the ancient readings, still it is the task of good editors, while preserving the written tradition, to solve difficulties by certain slight additions and interchanges."⁸

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

WARREN E. BLAKE.

⁸ Galen, VII, 894, cited by Bröcker, "Die Methoden Galens in der literarischen Kritik," *Rh. Mus.*, XL (1885), p. 418. Bröcker's article quotes many alterations made by Galen on the text of Hippocrates which are more extensive than those assumed here.

LATIN UXOR.

Meillet-Ernout explain Latin *uxor* as a "combination" of **uk-* and **-sōr-*: the first element **uk-* is found in Armenian *am-us-in* (*am* "with" + **uk-ino-*) "husband, wife"; the second element is identical with *-sor-* in IE **sue-sor* and the feminine forms of the figures Skt. *tisráh* "three," *cátasrah* "four." The original meaning of **sue-sor* is established as "la personne féminine du groupe" by Meillet-Ernout; according to Benveniste the independent word *sōr-* is represented by Av. *hāiriši-* = *hār-iš-i-* "woman, female."¹

If *-sor-* in *uxor* and **sue-sor* is identical, the difference in meaning of these two words must have its origin in the elements *uk-* and *sue-*. As a man does not marry his sister according to IE custom or law, it is probable that the meaning of the two words was antithetical.

In addition to IE **suesor*, **sue*, **se* "own" (Goth. *swes*, *sibja*, etc.²) occurs in another ancient name of kinship, IE **sue-krú* "mother of the husband" (Latin *socrus* "mother of the husband and of the wife," Old Church Slav. *svekry* "mother of the husband," etc.³). From the feminine **sue-krú* is derived the masculine **syé-kruro-* > **syé-kuro-*⁴ "the one who belongs with the mother of the husband" "husband of the mother-in-law" (Vedic *śvāsura-* "father of the husband," Greek *ἐκυρός*). That the husband's designation is derived from that of the wife is extraordinary in IE word-formation. It may well be that the mother of the husband played such an important rôle in the life of the young wife that she named the father of her husband after the all-important mother-in-law.⁵ Of the two ancient names designating a member of the family derived from **sue*, one clearly refers only to the family of the husband. If the meaning of IE **sue-sōr* and Latin *uxor* originally are antithetic in character, *u-* or *uk-* would point not to a member of the "own" (the husband's) family, but to somebody outside this family.

¹ Meillet-Ernout, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (2nd ed., 1939), p. 1143; Benveniste, *B. S. L.*, XXXV, pp. 104 ff.

² Walde-Pokorny, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II, pp. 454 ff.

³ Schulze, *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 60 ff.

⁴ Specht, *K. Z.*, LXV, p. 193. ⁵ Meillet-Ernout, *op. cit.*, pp. 948 f.

The Romans had two principal forms of marriage, the *manus*-marriage (of which three kinds existed) and the marriage *sine in manum conventionione*. Whereas the wife given away according to the *manus*-marriage became *mater familias* and was entitled to a share out of the inheritance of the husband's family, the *uxor* continued to be subject to the *potestas* of her father and to participate in the possessions of her family.⁶ She was to a certain degree an "outsider" in the family of her husband; we may, then, explain *uxor* as IE **u-k-sor*, in which *u* belongs with IE **au(e)* "away" (Latin *aufero*, Skt. *avabharati*, Latin *aufugio*, Goth. *auþeis*, etc.⁷).

There exists another group of words derived from an element *au-*, which originally referred only to relatives of the wife, Latin *avunculus*, OHG *oheim*, Lith. *avýnas*, Prussian *awis*, Church Slav. *ujz* "brother of the mother," etc.⁸ As *au-* in Latin *avunculus*, etc. and *u* in Latin *uxor* both point to kinship on the mother's side, they may be considered to represent the same element.

au(e) as an element denoting kinship is not isolated; it stands within a system of words distinguishing between the member of the own family, of the (own) house and that outside the own family, the stranger, the one which is living (far) "away" in the forest, in the desert: Skt. *amā* "at home," *amātyah* "member of the own house," *nītyah* "own," Goth. *niþjis* "kinsman," IE **suesōr*, "sister," *suekrū* "mother of the husband," etc. in contrast to Skt. *nīstyah* "foreign(er)" (*nīh* "out"), *āraṇa* "foreign," *āraṇye* "in the forest, in the desert," Lat. *uxor*, *avunculus*, Goth. *auþja*-, OHG *ōdi* "waste," "abgelegen."⁹

IE *-sōr-* in **suesōr* and *uxor* may be a combination of *-er/or-* characteristic of family-names as father, mother, etc. and an element *s* occurring in names of kinship as Hittite *hanzasa* "great-grandchild," Goth. *frasti-* "child"; it may be identical with Av. *hāir(iš)* = *hār-(iš-i)*.

Fritz Mezger.

Bryn Mawr College.

⁶ H. Blümner, *Die römischen Privataltertümer* (München, 1911), pp. 347 f.

⁷ Walde-Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, p. 79.

⁸ Hermann, *Gött. Nachr.*, 1918, pp. 214 f.

⁹ Schulze, *op. cit.*, pp. 70 ff.

NOTES ON GREEK POETRY.

Archilochus, 28¹

[ή δ'] ὥσπερ αὐλῶι βρυῶτον ἢ Θρείξ ἀνὴρ
ἢ Φρυξέξ βρυζε· κύβδα δ' ἦν πονευμένη.

I would supply ἢ δ'. The sense from here to ἔβρυζε seems to be clear if we consider Xenophon, *Anab.*, IV, 5, 26-27 . . . καὶ οἶνος κρίθινος ἐν κρατῆρσιν. ἐνῆσαν δὲ καὶ αὐταὶ αἱ κριθαὶ ἰσοχειλεῖς, καὶ κάλαμοι ἐνέκειντο, οἱ μὲν μείζους οἱ δὲ ἐλάττους, γόνατα οὐκ ἔχοντες. τούτους ἔδει ὅποτε τις διψῶν λαβόντα εἰς τὸ στόμα μύζειν. The lady is drinking beer through a straw. The last part may be taken in an obscene sense (so Edmonds, Gulick); but see Hesychius, πονεύμεναι· ἐπειγόμεναι. πονεῖν· ἐνεργεῖν. Might it mean "leaning forward in her eagerness?"

Archilochus, 58

τοῖς θεοῖς † τ' εἰθεῖ' ἅπαντα· πολλάκις μὲν ἐκ κακῶν
ἄνδρας ὀρθοῦσιν μελαίνῃ κειμένους ἐπὶ χθονί,
πολλάκις δ' ἀνατρέπονσι καὶ μάλ' εὖ βεβηκότας
ὑπτίους κ<λ>ίνουσ'· ἔπειτα πολλὰ γίγνεται κακά,
καὶ βίον χρήμη πλανᾶται καὶ νόου παρήγορος.

In line 1 τίθει πάντα and ἰθεῖα πάντα have been suggested, but far better is von Wilamowitz' latest reading (*Der Glaube der Hellenen*, II, pp. 114, n. 2) τοῖς θεοῖσι ρεῖα πάντα. He adduces Hesiod, *Erga*, 5-17, and Diehl adds Cercidas, 1, 6: ρεῖα γάρ ἐστι θεῶι πᾶν ἐκτελέσ<σ>αι. Better yet are *Il.*, III, 381: ρεῖα μάλ' ὥς τε θεός and Alcaeus, 78, 7: ῥῆα δ' ἀνθρώ[π]ο[ις] θα[ν]άτω ῥύεσθε, since both refer to *rescue* by divine intervention. See also Semonides, 27 and Theognis, 14. Probably the Homeric passage was somewhere in Archilochus' mind. He might also have been thinking of *Il.*, VII, 271-272, where Hector, knocked down by Aias, is set on his feet again: ὁ δ' ὑπτιος ἐξετανύσθη / ἀσπίδι ἐγχιρμιφθεῖς· τὸν δ' αἰψ' ὤρθωσεν Ἀπόλλων. Note the use in both of ὑπτιος and ὀρθόω.

Semonides, 7, 57-62

τὴν δ' ἵππος ἀβρὴ χαιτέεσσ' ἐγείνατο,
ἢ δούλι' ἔργα καὶ δύνῃ περιτρέπει,
κοῦτ' ἂν μύλης ψαύσειεν οὔτε κόσκινον

¹ All references for fragments are to Diehl.

ἄρειεν οὔτε κόπρον ἐξ οἴκου βάλοι,
οὔτε πρὸς ἱπνὸν ἀσβόλην ἀλευμένη
ἵζουτ'· ἀνάγκη δ' ἄνδρα ποιῖται φίλον.

In line 58 *περιτρέπει* has been generally seen to be unsatisfactory; *περιτρέχει* is the easiest and best correction, with the rest of the line standing as it is. In line 62 Edmonds translates "she taketh a mate only of necessity." This makes the *φίλον* entirely otiose, nor does this particular lady sound as if she wanted to be an old maid. I would translate "she makes her husband intimate with hard times," since the point is made just below (69-70) that such a woman is a luxury appropriate to kings or tyrants, who can afford her. For the thought in my translation, see Theognis, 351-352 ἃ δειλὴ πενίη, τί μένεις προλιπούσα παρ' ἄλλον / ἄνδρ' ἵεναι; μὴ δὴ μ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντα φίλει. Compare also Semonides later in this poem (101-102)

οὐδ' αἶψα λιμὸν οἰκίης ἀπώσεται,
ἐχθρὸν συνοικητῆρα, δυσμενέα θεόν.

Alcaeus, 46a and b

Heraclitus (Heraclides?) who quotes it (*Alleg. Hom.*, 5) makes 46a an allegorical poem, in which the storm and sea represent civic upheavals. This has, however, been doubted, most recently by C. W. Mendell, *Class. Phil.*, XXXIII (1938), p. 146. Writing on Horace, *Carm.*, I, 14, Professor Mendell remarks in passing: "There is no reason to consider the poem of Alcaeus as allegorical except the statement that it is so, made by Heraclides of Pontus in the fourth century before Christ. Heraclides was writing on Allegory in Homer, searching for instances to illustrate his theme." These remarks do not seem to be an essential part of Professor Mendell's interpretation of Horace, and it is hard to see why they are made. Why should Heraclitus not be right? If he was "searching for instances to illustrate his theme," that does not mean that he was manufacturing them, and, since he presumably had the entire poem before him, he may have found something there which made it clear that the ship in distress is meant to be allegorical (or, if the term be preferred, figurative). It may even be that we have the same evidence before us. Consider frag. 46b (ignored by Mendell), in the same metre as 46a. Here also, lines 1-6 deal with a ship in a storm; lines 7-10 proceed (as restored by Bowra):

κήγα μὲν ἐν τούτ[οισι κυλίνδεται]·
 τούτων λελάθων, [ὦ φίλε, βόλλομαι]
 σύν τ' ὕμμι τέρπ[εσθ]α[ι ~ - ~]
 καὶ πεδὰ Βύκχιδος αὖ [μεθύσθην].

μεθύσθην is, if not quite certain, extremely likely in view of frag. 91. In any case, the ship is at this point being dismissed. Now one does not step off a storm-tossed ship, in order to get a drink or for any other purpose. If 46b is part of the same poem as 46a (so Lobel, Edmonds, Diehl, and Bowra), this is decisive. If not, we are still left with a *figurative* ship in 46b, so that there is all the less reason to doubt Heraclitus and his figurative ship of 46a. Fragments 119, 120, 122 should also be considered, as here the figure of the ship leads directly to explicit political *paraenesis*. Finally, we may fairly ask, if 46a is not figurative, what is it? Do we, in fact, ever in Greek poetry find such a scene as this described in the present tense and meant to be taken literally? The only obvious example is Archilochus, 56; but this is also declared by Heraclitus to be allegorical, so we cannot argue from it either way. It may be noted that Mendell considers a literal interpretation of the Horatian poem, only to reject it as impossible.

Alcaeus, 94

τέγγε πλεύμονας οἶνωι· τὸ γὰρ ἄστρον περιτέλλεται.
 ἂ δ' ὦρα χαλέπα, πάντα δὲ δίψαισ' ὑπὰ καύματος,
 ἄχει δ' ἐκ πετάλων ἄδεα τέττιξ [~ ~ ~ ~ ~],
 ἄνθει καὶ σκόλυμος. νῦν δὲ γυναῖκες μαρώταται,
 λέπτοι δ' ἄνδρες, ἐπεὶ <καὶ> κεφάλαν καὶ γόνα Σείριος
 ἄσδει.

In line 3 λιγυρὸν μέλος is possible, but better perhaps would be λιγυρῶς ἄγαν, "And the almond tree shall flourish, and the grasshopper shall be a burden, and desire shall fail." In line 4 Powell, *C. Q.*, XX (1926), p. 185, has objected to μαρώταται on the ground that it should mean "bloodstained," "polluted"; he would suggest φιαρώταται, "plumpest." This is noted with approval by Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, pp. 165-6. But what we should like is a use of μαρώταται which would carry the meaning of Hesiod's μαχλόταται, and Bowra cites Sophocles, *Ant.*, 746 ὦ μαρὸν ἦθος καὶ γυναικὸς ὕστερον. This he translates "o lustful nature, worse than a woman's." But γυναικὸς ὕστερον is more likely to mean "which cannot resist a woman"; see Aristo-

phanes, *Nub.*, 1081 (of Zeus) κακείνος ὡς ἦττων ἔρωτός ἐστι καὶ γυναικῶν. This makes the point plainer. Add Euripides, *Hipp.*, 946 ἐπειδὴ γ' ἐς μίασμ' ἐλήλυθας, where lustfulness is clearly meant.

Mimnermus, 12, 5

κείθεν † διαστήεντος ἀπορνύμενοι ποταμοῖο.

Read δινῆεντος.

Simonides, 53

πόλις ἄνδρα διδάσκει.

Plutarch (*An seni*, 1) who quotes this obviously takes it to mean "the city teaches the man," and this has been generally accepted. It might, however, mean "the city reveals (the nature of) the man," for we have a parallel in Pindar, frag. 107, 6 (Bowra) διδάξαμεν χρυσὸν καθαρᾷ βασάνῳ (cf. *Pyth.*, X, 67). We should then have an earlier expression of the idea stated at greater length by Sophocles, *Ant.*, 175-177:

ἀμήχανον δὲ παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἐκμαθεῖν
ψυχὴν τε καὶ φρόνημα καὶ γνώμην, πρὶν ἂν
ἀρχαῖς τε καὶ νόμοισιν ἐντριβῆς φανῇ.

RICHMOND LATTIMORE,

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

Lieut. (j.g.), U. S. N. R.

DID MENANDER NOD? EPITREPONTES 53.

The recent appearance in this country of the First Part of Koerte's *Menandri quae supersunt* (Teubner, 1938) raises anew the problem of the distribution of parts in line 53 of the *Epitrepontes* among the three characters who participate in the arbitration scene—Smicrines the arbitrator, Davus the finder of the exposed baby, and Syrus, now foster-father of the child, who claims the child's recognition trinkets. It is a problem which has troubled the critics and editors of the newly found Menander since Lefevre's publication of the Cairo papyrus in 1907. The line is defective in that the third foot was omitted by the scribe. A change of speakers is indicated, not only by ΣΜΙΚ in the left margin before line 53, but also by the paragraphus and at the beginning of the fourth foot the double-point,

where Davus continues his narrative, which had been interrupted by the question which Smicrines addresses to Syrus, the claimant of the trinkets. On these points there has been a practical unanimity; also that the answer of Syrus to the question of Smicrines was an affirmative. The sole problem, then, which has been at issue some thirty years, is simply this: Did Menander cause Smicrines, in putting his question to Syrus, to address him by name, though he is as yet quite ignorant of it, or is that part of the line corrupt, or is there an alternative solution which leaves the Cairo text intact at this point?

The line as it stands in the papyrus is as follows:

ΣΜΙΚ ἔδέου Σύρικ': ὅλην τὴν [ῆ]μέραν

The early editors, following the punctuation of the papyrus, assigned the first two words to Smicrines; but the objection was soon raised that Smicrines could not have known the name of Syrus. Stephani¹ stands alone in his attempted solution—of continuing the entire line to Davus. Certain editors resorted to emendation: the Bodin-Mazon edition (1908): *Sm. ἔδέου σύ γ'*; *Sy. ἐδεόμην*; Sudhaus (1909), more radically: *Sm. ἔδέου σὸ ταῦτ'*; *Sy. φήμ'*; and I, in my edition (1910), before I had seen Sudhaus: *Sm. ἔδέου σὸ ταῦτ'*; *Sy. εἰ ἴσθ'*. Koerte, however, in his *Menandrea* (1912) followed the papyrus in assigning the first two words to Smicrines, and attributed the resulting oversight to the poet's carelessness: "quamquam constat Syrisi nomen Smicrini non esse notum, tamen Menandrum hanc rem neglexisse crediderim." It was fairly obvious that no students of Menander were entirely satisfied with either the guesswork of emendation or the attribution of so glaring an error to the poet. Certainly that was true of myself, for I regretted my rash attempt at emendation soon after my edition was published and wrote in my margin what I thought then and still think is the simplest and most plausible solution.²

In his latest edition, however, Koerte minimizes the poet's

¹ *B. p. W.*, 1910, p. 476. For the titles, places of publication, etc., of the other editors or commentators mentioned the reader is referred to Koerte's bibliographies in his two Teubner editions of 1912 and 1938.

² This was communicated to Professor Allinson, who was engaged in the preparation of the principal fragments of Menander for the Loeb Classical Library, and adopted by him.

supposed error as trivial and attempts even to justify it by ascribing to it an artistic motive; for the note in the 1912 edition, quoted above, is now amplified thus: "... hanc minutiam neglexisse, nam vix fieri potest, ut Smicrines tam longae orationi silens astaret." This seems to mean that Menander's lapse was intentional, since it enabled him the better to characterize the bored arbitrator. But that would have been accomplished equally well by the mere interruption, without the use of Syrus' name; and, in my opinion, Menander was intent upon representing Smicrines, as he passed judgment, all unconsciously, upon the fate of his own grandchild, as an honorable, if somewhat irascible, judge, who by his questions was trying to get at the bottom of the situation by verifying every significant statement of the grasping Davus.

The matter is important enough, as bearing upon Menander's art in a play which in the opinion of both ancients and moderns was among his masterpieces, to justify further examination. But first of all we should recognize the sharp distinction to be made between the poet's introduction of his characters to his audience and his making the participants in a dialogue acquainted with each other.

Menander made it a point, so far as his works are known to us, to acquaint his audience promptly with the names of his characters as they appeared on the scene. This was a not inconsiderable element in clothing each actor with an individuality of his own. And certain types in the New Comedy became so thoroughly individualized that their names themselves came to connote certain characteristics. An Onesimus was a busybody—he must know everything; a Cario was a cook, garrulous, fussy, self-important; a Smicrines was a crotchety, stingy old man, etc. For that reason a large group of names recur time and again in different plays of the New Comedy—a fact that caused Koerte, for example, to hold out stubbornly for some twenty years against the attribution of the St. Petersburg fragment to the *Epitrepontes* (see his *Menandrea*, Praef., pp. xxii ff.), a position which he has now, fortunately, reversed. But it was by no means always important that the participants in a dialogue should know each other by name, and the arbitration scene in the *Epitrepontes* furnishes an excellent example. Smicrines scorns the two country bumpkins who ask him to arbitrate their dispute and he never uses their names (excepting, for the moment,

line 53), although Davus discloses his own and his antagonist's names. They are old acquaintances. This is done for the sake of the audience, for Syrus is to play a large part in the next scene, which leads up to the discovery. As for Smicrines, the slaves had no idea who he was and did not need to know: he had simply happened along when their dispute had reached an impasse and they wanted an arbitrator. In addressing him they use *βέλτιστε* and *πάτερ*, recognizing his superior status. But he had been made known to the audience in the initial scene of the play, preserved in the St. Petersburg parchment. His soliloquy there, a denunciation of his son-in-law Charisius, is overheard by several of the young husband's intimates who are on the way to a drinking party Charisius is giving. It would seem, therefore, that Syrus' name in line 53 is not an inadvertence on the poet's part and therefore not intended to be spoken by Smicrines; but it does serve the purpose of making the name of this character, who soon takes part in a long scene (165-201), familiar to the audience. Also it should prove to be entirely appropriate and natural to the character who speaks it.

The alternative, then, is to assign *Σύρισκ'* to the other interlocutor, Davus. He, noticing that Syrus hesitates a bit, calls upon him to answer. Such impatience is characteristic of Davus throughout this scene. We have only to assume that the scribe omitted to write the double point after *ἔδέου*. This punctuation was duly transcribed after *Σύρισκ'*, and it may well be that this accounts for the omission of the answer, the scribe's eye having jumped from the double point after *Σύρισκ'* to the next one before *τὴν*, etc.

Koerte cites Allinson's work in his critical notes, but he evidently viewed this solution with such disfavor as not even to mention it. And yet it is the only solution that both adheres to the Cairo text and at the same time involves no presumption of error or oversight on Menander's part. The more's the pity, for Koerte's new edition marks a distinct advance in Menandrian studies. Let us hope that the contemplated Second Part of this edition will soon see the light.

The line should read as it stands in Allinson's edition:

Sm. *ἔδέου;*

Da. *Σύρισκ'!*

Sy. *<ἔγωγ'>*

Da. *ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν*

EDWARD CAPPS.

TACITUS' ANNALS, IV, 12.

The purpose of this note is to show that, without alteration of the MSS reading, the sentence (in IV, 12 of Tacitus' *Annals*) which begins *Atque haec callidis criminatoribus* is perfectly capable of accurate interpretation and that the difficulties¹ which beset the passage are the result of mistaken editorial comment.

The simplest way to present the proper interpretation is to translate the passage into English along with the preceding sentence.

The MSS read (if what is probably modern editorial punctuation be ignored) as follows:

Igitur contumaciam eius insectari, vetus Augustae odium, recentem Liviae conscientiam exagitare, ut superbam fecunditate, subnixam popularibus studiis inhiare dominationi apud Caesarem arguerent. Atque haec callidis criminatoribus inter quos delegerat Iulium Postumum per adulterium Mutiliae Priscae inter intimos aviae et consiliis suis peridoneum quia Prisca in animo Augustae valida anum suapte natura potentiae anxiam insociabilem nurui efficiebat.

The proposed rendering is:

"And so Sejanus set about to make the most of Agrippina's stubbornness, to arouse Augusta's long-standing hatred of Agrippina, and to remind Livia of her recently acquired guilt so that these forces might in Tiberius' mind convict Agrippina, who was proud of her children and supported by popular acclaim, of seeking imperial power. And these aims Sejanus accomplished by means of artful calumniators among whom he placed Julius Postumus, a man who because of his adultery with Mutilia Prisca was close to the grandmother of Livia and well fitted to further Sejanus' plans because he did, with the help of Prisca's influence upon Augusta, make the old lady—who was by nature jealous of her power—less than cordial to her grandson's wife, Agrippina."

¹ The difficulties are not of recent origin. In the 1672 edition of J. F. and J. Gronovius the words from *inter* to *valida* are in parentheses, making less than satisfactory sense and leaving *haec* to be either subject of *efficiebat* or without any function at all. There is quoted in this edition a comment of Acidalius and presumably an emendation: *Ad haec. Efficiebat nempe Sejanus. non enim capi potest de Livia.* But the editors Furneaux (1904) and Goelzer (1924) both take *haec* as Livia and as subject of *efficiebat*.

In this version the phrase *Prisca . . . valida* is treated either as an ablative absolute or as an ablative which bears to *efficiebat* the same relation that *criminatoribus* bears to the omitted main verb. There is no reason to deny such an interpretation. Indeed the only other functions *Prisca* could have are these: 1) Subject of the clause *quia . . . valida*. (But it is not Tacitus' habit to omit the verb of *quia* clauses.) 2) Subject of the verb *efficiebat*. (But the context is dominated by Julius Postumus. Why bring him in if *Prisca* did the work?)

In this version, too, the clause *quia . . . efficiebat*, with Julius Postumus as subject, gives the reason why Tacitus calls Julius Postumus *peridoneum*. Tacitus uses *quia* to introduce clauses which give the justification for a previous statement.²

In this version the word *aviae* is most appropriate. The whole passage is a description of Sejanus' efforts to thwart the imperial hopes of the sons of Germanicus. There is a significant antithesis between the phrases *inter intimos aviae* and *insociabilem nurui efficiebat*: Julius Postumus was close to Augusta, Livia's grandmother, and alienated Augusta (who was by nature fond of power) from Agrippina who was after all only her grandson's wife. That is, Augusta favored the faction in which she had a living grandchild.

The word *aviae* in this sentence has misled some editors into thinking that *aviae suae* is implied, with the result that they have read *haec* as though it referred to Livia (the only person concerned to whom Augusta is *avia*) and made it the subject of the sentence. Actually, of course, *aviae* merely gives the reason why Augusta was willing to favor the sons of Livia over those of Germanicus.

C. ARTHUR LYNCH.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

² Cf. *Annals*, XIII, 15, 12; XIII, 31, 11; *et passim*.

REVIEWS.

JOHN H. FINLEY, JR. *Thucydides*. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1942. Pp. 344. \$3.50.

A first-class study of any author demands a carefully acquired and affectionately nurtured intimacy with his work. Thucydides, who has for some time needed such a study, and classical scholarship, which has not always been willing to treat ancient writers comprehensively, are under the deepest obligations to Professor Finley, who has written a book that meets these requirements and that will remain a standard treatment of Thucydides. For the great merit of Finley's book is that he never loses sight of the *History* as a whole. An obvious master of detail, he does not tire the reader with undue emphasis upon minor points, nor does he elaborate single incidents and thus isolate them from the main theme; throughout his writing he keeps the reader conscious of the fact that he ever maintains his grip upon all eight books of the *History*.

Actually, Finley's study consists of more than this volume. As he notes in his Foreword, the groundwork was laid in three earlier articles, all of which appeared in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*: "Euripides and Thucydides," XLIX (1938), pp. 23-68; "The Origins of Thucydides' Style," L (1939), pp. 35-84; "The Unity of Thucydides' History," Supplementary Volume I (1940), pp. 255-97. These papers form an important and integral part of the whole work and this reviewer, at least, who prefers to see related essays gathered between one pair of covers rather than scattered among four, regrets that they, long as they are, were not incorporated in the book. As it is, although he frequently (and inconveniently) refers to the articles, Finley at times repeats material instead of assuming their conclusions.

I have already stated that this is a splendid book. The argument, however, is close and tightly woven; thus it is not easy to do justice to the author in the restricted space of a review. The work teems with provocative ideas. The student of Thucydides must read it for himself and it is only upon this understanding that I select a few of the more interesting passages for comment and criticism. But criticism must not detract from my admiration for Finley's accomplishment.

Generally speaking, the book falls into three parts: the first three chapters deal with the life, background, and plan of Thucydides; the next three take up the *History*; the two final chapters treat style and thought. At the end Finley gives good maps of Central Greece and Peloponnesus, the Siege of Syracuse, Pylos, and Sicily according to Thucydides. The book concludes with a bibliography (which, although presented as short, includes all the really important studies and editions) and a soundly constructed and detailed index.

A striking section of the work—and one which impresses the reader with Finley's control of the literature of Thucydides' lifetime—discusses the historian's intellectual background and the origins of his antithetical style, the first consciously artistic prose. Here the parallels with pre-war literature, especially with Euripides,

illustrate the thesis that Thucydides' style and thought are not out of keeping with the intellectual changes that occurred in Athens before the outbreak of war. The sophists (especially Protagoras) and the Hippocratic *Corpus* play an important part in Finley's convincing demonstration that the intellectual awakening and the impact of sophistic thought were felt in Athens before Gorgias' visit in 427 B. C. Thus the early speeches, occurring in pairs, with their antithetical construction and their insistence upon τὸ εἰκός, τὸ συμφέρον, and φύσις, common sophistic themes, present a reasonably authentic picture of men's minds in the period in which they purport to have been delivered. This conclusion is indispensable to an intelligent understanding of the speeches.

Finley describes the family background and the intense political society in which Thucydides was raised, quite properly emphasizing his connection with the conservative, oligarchic Philaidæ. It is then stated that "as a young man he broke with his traditions to become a democrat and a Periclean," "he greatly admired both the policies of Pericles and the united democracy which Pericles represented" (pp. 19, 20, 30-2). These views permeate the first chapter and recur in chapter VI (The Sicilian Expedition): "he was incapable of conceiving a great progressive city except as a democracy" (p. 237), "the moderate constitution of the Five Thousand . . . must have seemed to him a second best" (p. 248).

With this I find it difficult to agree. That Thucydides was a Periclean is undeniable, but to be a Periclean was not of necessity to be a convinced democrat. Thucydides, oligarchic by upbringing, followed Pericles the man, but not the party or the form of government. He admired the democracy, and its progressive, vital force, only in so far as he admired the idealized democracy of Pericles. It is a question whether in 431 B. C. Pericles was a genuine democrat; his position and nature are unique, whether compared to his predecessors or his successors. Thucydides himself supplies the evidence for his own political views. In writing of his hero Pericles he specifically separates him from a democratic form of government (II, 65, 9, ἐγγίνεται τε λόγῳ μὲν δημοκρατία, ἔργῳ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή), and in his account of the constitution of the Five Thousand he comments (VIII, 97, 2), καὶ οὐχ ἥκιστα δὴ τὸν πρῶτον χρόνον ἐπὶ γε ἐμοῦ Ἀθηναῖοι φαίνονται εὖ πολιτεύσαντες. These do not ring of the convinced democrat, and the latter statement (which differs from Finley's interpretation of it cited above) remains the clearest affirmation of Thucydides' genuine convictions, without the domination of Pericles' presence. And it is only after Pericles' death that Thucydides so scathingly indicts the decadence of the Athenians, which Finley with great power places in the foreground of his narrative.

From Pericles we may proceed to Nicias, and once again I am not sure that Finley's portrayal (from Thucydides' exposition) is quite accurate. Nicias "was in many ways a negative figure. . . . He represents in Athens the attitude of ἡσυχία . . . which at the start of the war had seemed characteristic of Sparta" (pp. 216-17, before the Sicilian expedition; cf. p. 196 for "his famous and fatal hesitancy" in the debate with Cleon concerning the crisis of Pylos). But Nicias was the natural heir of Pericles (and even more clearly than his master a conservative in the pages of Thucydides) and, if

not of the same genius, by opposing expansion he was simply following the policies he had inherited; if, in so doing, he was guilty of a fatal *ἡσυχία*, then the same charge may be levelled against Pericles in 432/1 B. C. I suspect that, in the days of Pylos, Nicias' offer to resign his command to Cleon was a sheer gamble; he hoped for what seemed a certainty, his rival's failure (cf. Thucydides' curt summary, IV, 39, 3, *καὶ τοῦ Κλέωνος καίπερ μανιώδης οὔσα ἡ ὑπόσχεσις ἀπέβη*), which might have eliminated a dangerous and un-Periclean element from the state. Nicias was, let us grant, afflicted with a form of *ἡσυχία*; but that *ἡσυχία* was evident not so much in the framing of state policies (in which sphere he followed Pericles closely) as in the personal timidity and sense of insecurity which tortured him when decisive action had to be taken.

The most significant feature of Finley's contribution is his belief in and convincing demonstration of the essential unity of the *History*. The subject is developed at length in the article of 1940 cited above, but it runs throughout the book. It is Thucydides' way, as Finley shows with admirable force, to make the general statement and from time to time to glance at it, forward or backward, if only by implication; thus the *History* is bound together around these topic sentences or ideas and it becomes impossible to sever one section from another on the basis of period of composition. The important themes are always recognizable. It is interesting to observe that Finley himself follows much the same method and achieves much the same unity of subject.

The *History* is based upon two vital concepts, which constantly recur: the progressive naval greatness of Athens (as opposed to the unprogressive weakness of Sparta) and the political weakness of Athens (as opposed to the unity of Sparta). The one brought unexcelled prosperity, the other utter ruin. Similarly, Thucydides ever anticipates and recalls the Sicilian expedition, which forms, as it were, the core of his *History*.

The victory of Pylos (amazing to the Hellenic world) is the first great climax; but, as the departure of the fleet for Syracuse brings to an even greater climax Thucydides' presentation of Athens' enormous inherent strength, so the speech of Alcibiades at Sparta (VI, 89-92) consummates the historian's judgment of Athens' inner decay.

The war is pictured vividly as a struggle between two ways of life. Much attention is paid by Finley to democracy as a form of government. Its "vitalizing and propagandist" force is explained and its eventual decadence is pitilessly exposed. Finley is acute enough to perceive the two connotations of *δημοκρατία*: the rule of the people and the rule of the poor. The decline of the first into the second is a change which occurred during Thucydides' lifetime. As, according to Aristotle's classification, oligarchy becomes plutocracy, so democracy can become what we may perhaps term "penetocracy."

It would be unjust to pass by the insistence with which Finley, in describing Athenian experience, constantly implies the modern parallel. His study frequently reads like an analysis of contemporary democracy and its problems; the fate of Athens should be a serious lesson today. In particular, I emphasize the connection asserted between democracy and empire, both resting upon the solid basis of

naval power; the one could not have flourished without the other, and neither without the third. So Thucydides, in the *Archaeology*, prepares to identify Athens' strength as naval power and democracy, while Sparta relied upon stability of government.

From the various references to Athenian interest in Sicily and Italy (e.g., pp. 115, 212-13) I suspect that Finley places Athens' western aspirations rather late. Themistocles' daughters, Italia and Sybaris (Plutarch, *Themistocles*, 32, 2), should be considered in this connection, and Athens had already clashed once (in the First Peloponnesian War) with Corinth on the question of harbors and the western trade; in fact, Athens' land empire in many ways pointed towards the west. Finally, if Athenian western policy was largely defensive at the beginning of the second war, I doubt very much that this is true of the pre-war days.

Finley refers to "contemporary shipping, which lacked the use of the compass and for the most part hugged the coastline" (p. 214). I am not sure that the compass was indispensable in the ancient Mediterranean and I wonder if Finley is familiar with Gomme's strong argument (*Essays in Greek History and Literature*, pp. 190-203) that, while triremes perforce clung to the coast, Greek merchantmen did not.

This book contains many striking expressions and judgments. Thucydides' *History* is "a treatise on the nature of freedom and authority, of material progress and social decay, backed by the experience of a generation" (p. 7). Pericles "could see and expound what was necessary, he was patriotic and above money. Athens' misfortune and the essential cause of her ruin was that none of his successors combined all these traits. Nicias, who was honest but inactive, had the last two; Alcibiades, who was able but utterly self-interested, had the first two; only the Syracusan Hermocrates combined them all" (p. 203). "The tragic fact of the *History* is that it shows a great and promising people fail of their political mission, and thereby leave their civilization lastingly divided, because they wished to fulfill it brutally and at once" (pp. 220-1). The condition "whereby a general in the field never escaped the specter of abuse, prejudice, and ignorance at home comes near being the *reductio ad absurdum* of popular government" (p. 236).

Finley cannot be read casually; he writes well but his style is philosophic and complex. It is the more regrettable that the composition is occasionally marred by infelicities. The rare "seemingly" is much too frequent (e.g., pp. 13, 17, 26; *passim* in the article of 1940), "around" is not good in the chronological sense of "about" (p. 13), colloquialisms are not absent, and the classicist should certainly prefer the correct "interpretative" to the falsely formed "interpretive" (pp. 287, 297, 298). On p. 129 there is confusion of number ("But if either . . . they are . . .") and on p. 270, within the parentheses, the pronoun "him" is not clear. Finley is fond of the subjunctive, at times excessively so (on p. 129 "were intended" is surely wrong); "there that that" (p. 285) needs no further comment.

The proof has been read efficiently. At the foot of p. 308 read "that one" for "the one"; Woodhouse's initials are W. J., not W. S. (p. 207, note 4); a comma is missing at the bottom of p. 223; the typesetting could have been improved on p. 106, note 51 and p. 279, note 27.

Finley does not demonstrate familiarity with the inscriptions; at least, he never cites the latest editions of the texts to which he refers. *I. G.*, I², 51 and 52 need a reference to Tod, nos. 58 and 57 (p. 116, note 10 and p. 212, note 15); *I. G.*, I², 63 (p. 195, note 59) is archaic in view of the complete reconstruction by Meritt and West (1934) and an even more recent publication in 1939 (*The Athenian Tribute Lists*, I). A knowledge of these works would enable Finley to place the assessment in its proper chronological setting (after, not before, Cleon's victory at Pylos) and to avoid perpetuating an old error by mention of the "doubling of the tribute" (it was more than trebled). On p. 208 the same document is called a "tribute list."

In Thucydides, I, 101, 3 I find no mention of Cimon (p. 14). Authors of chapters in *The Cambridge Ancient History* merit citation by name (p. 161, note 8 and p. 195, note 59; Adcock is the name to be supplied in each case). The inking on the map of the Siege of Syracuse is faint. To the Bibliography may now be added the translation of Thucydides in F. R. B. Godolphin (ed.), *The Greek Historians*, I (Random House, 1942) and the Modern Library's handsome edition of Crawley (1934). There is a false reference to p. 27 in the Index under Thucydides, son of Melesias.

Let there be no mistake, however,—Finley's studies mark a high point in Thucydidean scholarship.

MALCOLM F. MCGREGOR.

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI.

Papyri in the Princeton University Collections. Volume III. Edited with Notes by A. C. JOHNSON and S. P. GOODRICH. Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press, 1942. Pp. xii + 124. (*Princeton University Studies in Papyrology*, No. 4.)

Professor Johnson and his collaborators are to be congratulated on having brought to completion with this volume the publication of the important collection of papyri at Princeton University. To the three volumes of *Papyri in the Princeton University Collections* are to be added the John H. Scheide biblical papyri deposited at Princeton and published in 1938 as No. 3 of the *Princeton University Studies in Papyrology*, E. H. Kase's dissertation, *A Papyrus Roll in the Princeton Collection* (Baltimore, 1933), and a number of texts published in articles (see *P. Princeton*, I, vii, n. 1 and II, v, n. 3). The total number of documents, long and short, amounts to considerably more than two hundred, and the publication has extended over eleven years. Those who are familiar with the difficulties of this kind of work will realize that the Princeton editors have by no means been slow.

The volumes are comparatively small in size and much more easily handled than the great tomes in which publications of papyri were often formerly presented. The texts are given in large clear Greek type and are supplied with introductions and notes which are brief and to the point. The editors have refrained from attempting, in a first publication, to make their discussions absolutely exhaustive. They have wisely adopted the practice of numbering the documents consecutively. Volume III contains Nos. 108-191. The first six

items are fragments of extant literary works, from the *Iliad*, Xenophon's *Hellenica*, and Isocrates' *Antidosis*. Nos. 114 and 115 are small pieces from a medical treatise and perhaps from a philosophical work. Of the non-literary items which make up the remainder of the volume the most interesting are perhaps the following:

- No. 117. Petition of the first century B. C. concerning a deposit of wheat.
- Nos. 118 and 119. Documents of the second and fourth centuries concerned with disputes about the ownership of valuable property.
- No. 124. Report on the question of whether certain persons could establish their status as *metropolitai*.
- Nos. 126-128. Letter and reports of the second century mentioning *exetastai*, *eklogistes*, *laographoi*, and *plerotai*.
- No. 129. Census declaration of 188/9 giving new information about the date of the prefect Tineius Demetrius.
- No. 131, A. D. 197. Receipt for taxes on the transfer of catocic land.
- No. 136. Fourth or fifth century land register of fair length, recording taxes in kind.
- No. 144. Third century loan agreement with right of *enoikesis* in lieu of interest.
- No. 151. Lease of slaves (?). See the discussion below.
- Nos. 165 and 166. Private letters with interesting features.

These Princeton papyri have now been handsomely published, but of course they are not "finished." Argument and questioning continue unendingly, and other scholars always have disagreements to record with the interpretations of the original editors. My own small contributions to the discussion of Volume III follow.

No. 112, III *verso*, lines 2-3 and note. It seems unlikely that the scribe would write $\eta\nu$ by error for $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. Observation of the number of letters in these lines makes it seem most probable that $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ was the last word in line 2; if so, we have here a genuine if unimportant new reading: $\acute{\omega}\nu \epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma \eta\nu \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \sigma\tau\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu$, etc.

No. 123. $\mu\eta\tau\rho\acute{\varsigma} \tau\eta\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ is naturally preceded by $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma \nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ or by $\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$; in the former case the man who is listed immediately above would be called $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$. This leads one to question the advisability of supplying $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ in col. 1, lines 13 and 16.

No. 125, line 9, note. The *naubion* would not "normally be a twentieth of the preceding total of 2010 dr.," but $\frac{1}{20}$ of the charge for $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\iota\alpha \acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\pi}\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\nu$ plus $\frac{1}{10}$ of the charge for $\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\iota\alpha \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\omicron\nu$; i. e., $\frac{1440}{20} + \frac{570}{10} = 129$, which would be entered as 130. The follow-

ing statement that "the supplement should be 420 dr. [or 425] instead of 320" is correct; that this error was carried through to the final total (not given here) is shown by the amount of the exchange charge (65 dr., $\frac{1}{60}$ of 3900 dr.). The scribe's arithmetic seems to be unusually inaccurate throughout this receipt.

No. 131. Introduction, line 6. The ten percent tax on sales of land was 10% of the *selling price*; here we have an amount (21 dr.)

which is about 10% of the *transfer tax* on the sale. The selling price must have been much larger (see No. 149, Introduction, for examples of land prices in this period). These 21 dr. would perhaps be best explained as interest on unpaid balances.

No. 151. Supported by suggestions from my colleagues W. L. Westermann, K. von Fritz, and R. Taubenschlag, I am venturing to present the view that the female creatures leased in this contract belonged to the bovine and not to the human family.

[τ]άς in line 6 is most surprising; we should expect at this point a noun describing the creatures which are the subject of the contract. For [τ]άς I suggest [βό]ας, and in line 8, after ἐτέρα, possibly there is room for δ[άμα]λιν. If these supplements should be correct, we would have here a full-grown red cow and a white heifer. It may seem strange that these animals had personal names, but the two cows sold in *P. Gen.*, 48 (A. D. 346) are also named. Apart from nursing contracts, in which the nurse did not leave her owner's premises but took the child home with her, we do not seem to have in the papyri examples of leases of female slaves. But in these nursing contracts and receipts (*B. G. U.*, IV, 1053, 1109, 1111, 1112, 1153; *P. Oxy.*, I, 91; *P. Tebt.*, II, 399; see v. Bolla, *Münch. Beitr.*, XXX, p. 76), the rate of payment runs from 10 to 12 or more drachmas (the price of 1 to 3 artabs of wheat) a month in the early imperial period. This included all the infant's expenses, and those of the nurse fell upon the owner; on the other hand, the nurse's miscellaneous services were available to her master. In view of these rates the rental in *P. Princeton*, 151 of 6 artabs of wheat per year seems impossibly low for two slave women. In *B. G. U.*, 912 (33 A. D.) we find a female donkey and her colt leased at 3 dr. per month; the value of donkeys and that of cows seem not to have differed widely, and the rental is perhaps approximately equivalent to that stated in the Princeton document. The colors "red" (red-haired?) and "white" (not a negress?) seem a strange combination for two women; both πυρρός (φύρος) and λευκός seem to be used predominantly for animals (for "red" cows see *P. Gen.*, 48, 8; *P. Lond.*, III, 839, 6; 890, 5; for "white," *P. Lond.*, 890, 6). Also the ἀθάνατος clause (see v. Bolla, pp. 66-82) and the assignment of the offspring to the lessee, which appears to go with it as compensation for the risk involved, seem quite natural for domestic animals, but, as the editors of this document have pointed out, are contrary to established legal practice for slaves.

No. 163, line 4. Is it possible to read ἐπαναβαίνης (with a meaning similar to that in Thucydides, VII, 29, 3)?

No. 164, line 8. The translation "confound him" seems somewhat doubtful. But if we take αὐτό as referring to μνηαῖον, ἐκπλέξωμεν is not easy to interpret. (From ἐκπλέκω?)

No. 190. Probably this letter was written in Alexandria (see Wileken, *Grundzüge*, pp. 122-3).

Whether a reviewer should meticulously record misprints and similar slips of slight importance is a moot question. The following short list may be of some assistance.

No. 108. Introduction, line 7. For "almost 5 m." read "more than 5 m." Line 8. For "itacism" read "etacism."

No. 112. Comparison of the notes at the bottom of p. 6 with the

text produces some confusion as to the exact reading of this fragment.

No. 119, line 1. *προτηκῶρων* instead of *προτηκτόρων*: misprint or scribe's error?

No. 125, line 8 of translation. For 100 read 110.

No. 127, line 3 of translation. For "Philadelphia" read "Theadelphia,"

No. 136, lines 2, 3, and 4 of translation. For $\frac{61}{64}$ read $\frac{29}{64}$.

No. 146, line 3 of translation. For 40 read 45.

† CLINTON W. KEYES.

WILLIAM BELL DINSMOOR. Observations on the Hephaisteion. American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1941. Pp. 171; 76 text figures. (*Hesperia*, Supplement V.)

The Hephaestion ("Theseum") has been the Cinderella among the temples of Athens. Less grand than the Parthenon, less lovely than the Erechtheum, poorer in cult associations than either of them, the temple on Colonus has long been overshadowed by its sisters on the Acropolis. Ancient authors have left us only the most casual references to the sanctuary, while modern scholars have concerned themselves more with the problem of its identification than with the quality of its architecture. Until 1936 the building had never been completely explored; no set of plans and no monograph adequate by modern standards was available for its study; nor had its identification been certainly established.

In the hope of filling some of these wants, the excavators of the adjoining Agora arranged for the inclusion of the temple within their area of operations and in the spring of 1936 thoroughly explored the hilltop around the building. The clearing of bedrock exposed the line of the ancient precinct wall, brought to light traces of a garden that had once formed the setting of the temple, and revealed the remains of many metal-working establishments, thus clinching the identification of the building as the Temple of Hephaestus.

In 1936-37 Professor A. K. Orlandos, acting for the Greek Government, consolidated the pronaos of the temple and removed a wall which had been built across the east end of the cella in 1835. The demolition of this wall yielded several ancient blocks derived from the temple.

Finally, in the spring of 1939, the excavators of the Agora removed the earth filling from within the building and so made possible the study of its foundations.

Professor Dinsmoor worked over all the new material on the spot in the summers of 1937 and 1939. From this new evidence, combined with an already intimate acquaintance with the building, he has produced some notable additions to our knowledge of its history, design, and sculpture.

Of the many drawings in the book, some were done by the author, most by John Travlos; the photographs are by Alison Frantz. Among them, they have made the evidence easily accessible. A complete index helps toward the same end.

The excavations revealed that the pavements and even the foundations of the temple were riddled with tombs made in the Mediaeval and Turkish periods. Practically all of these burial places are nameless and of interest chiefly for the light they throw on the progressive mutilation of the building. Some of them, however, had housed the remains of distinguished foreigners who died while visiting Greece. Among the tombstones recovered in the recent excavation is a complete slab from the grave of George Watson (*obit* 1810) with a Latin epitaph by Lord Byron. Several fragments from another stone are shown by Dinsmoor to be from the grave of John Tweddel, the young and talented friend of Lord Elgin (*obit* 1799). The identification and discussion of these stones adds much to a colorful chapter in the history of travel in the Near East, and the wealth of literary associations adduced by Dinsmoor lends to them an interest seldom exceeded by Athenian tombstones of more venerable antiquity.

The complete exposure of the foundations of the temple and of the bedrock within and around it has shown conclusively that the present building had no substantial predecessor. From traces of burning and from broken pottery of fine quality it may be inferred, however, that a sanctuary had previously existed on the hilltop and that it had suffered at the hands of the Persians. Dinsmoor makes clear that the foundations for the peristyle of the temple with the lowest step of limestone, the two upper of marble, are certainly all of one period and hence the disparity in the material can no longer be used as evidence (as has been done in the past) for a lengthy interruption in the construction of the building. The stratification shows that work proceeded from the outside inward, i. e. first were laid the foundations for the peristyle, then for the cella walls, finally for the interior columns.

From a close study of the foundations for the walls and porches of the cella it is apparent that both the dimensions and the proportions of this part of the building underwent several significant changes during construction. The width of the cella was increased by $\frac{3}{4}$ feet; the length of the room was reduced by three alterations, viz. the inward extension of the pronaos first by about $2\frac{3}{4}$ feet, then by about 1 foot and by the inward extension of the opisthodomos by $2\frac{1}{3}$ feet. Dinsmoor supposes that these changes were necessitated by a belated decision to include interior columns in the plan of the cella; they resulted also in a perceptible modernizing of the proportions of the building.

The most startling result of the recent exploration was the discovery of clear evidence for columns within the cella. The tenuous remnants of their foundations, a fragmentary architrave block, several hitherto unnoticed details in the fabric of the building, supplemented by exhaustive calculations from proportions and analogy, have made it certain that a Doric colonnade two storeys in height rose close in front of the flank walls and carried across the back of the room; it is little short of certain that there were five columns on either side, three across the end, the corner columns counted twice. One will readily appreciate how these colonnades must have increased the apparent scale of the room and enriched an otherwise excessively austere interior.

Dinsmoor raises again the long vexed question as to whether the walls of the temple were painted in antiquity. He accepts as

evidence of an intention to plaster and to paint the walls the fact (already observed by earlier students) that the inner faces of the walls of the cella, of the pronaos, and of the opisthodomos are lightly stippled. As additional evidence for the same intention he points out that the vertical wall joints are sealed with lead, presumably to protect the plaster from moisture. Since, however, no trace of ancient plaster is to be found on the walls, he concludes that they were neither stuccoed nor painted in antiquity and suggests that the original intention was to yield to the (tardy) decision to insert interior columns which would have interfered with the paintings.

This plausible hypothesis is open to many objections, several of which have been admitted by the author in the text. At the risk of prolonging this apparently interminable controversy, another point may be raised here. Dinsmoor adduces as the closest analogy for the wall treatment of the Hephaestion the wall blocks of the neighboring Stoa of Zeus which are likewise smooth on one face, rough picked on the other and are channeled for a lead sealing. But he fails to point out a further similarity, viz. that the Stoa blocks, although well preserved, show no trace of plaster and undoubtedly were never plastered. Two other fifth century buildings enter into the argument; the Pinacotheca of the Propylaea and the east cella of the Erechtheum. Of these, the former was certainly intended for paintings, the latter certainly received paintings in antiquity. But in neither of these buildings will one find lead-sealed joints or stippled walls.

In view of the above difficulties, the reviewer would prefer to maintain an alternative hypothesis that was considered but rejected by the author, viz. that the roughened wall surface was intended to remain visible and to provide a contrast in surface texture with the adjoining smooth polished areas, which in fact it does do in a satisfactory way.

A very gratifying result of the study is additional light on the cult statues. The new evidence is derived chiefly from two blocks of dark Eleusinian limestone which undoubtedly came from the pedestal. Fragments of clay moulds found in a casting pit in a back corner of the precinct were in all probability stripped by Alcamenes from the cult statues of Hephaestus and Athena on which he worked between 421/0 and 416/5 B. C.

Dinsmoor has located the pedestal for the cult statues within the cella principally on the evidence of two masses of masonry which project inward like ears from the foundations for the interior columns. These "ears," lying beneath the ends of a long transverse pedestal, would, however, have furnished the most precarious possible support. Such a conjunction of foundations, moreover, is contrary to the general practice elsewhere in the building. Again, the reviewer is inclined to hold to an alternative view rejected by the author and to regard the ears as an indication of a change in the placing of the foundations for the interior columns.

Another sculptural by-product of the recent excavations is a marble head found in the Agora near by but certainly identified by the author as the long missing head of King Eurystheus from the Heracles and the Boar metope in the east front of the temple. The recovery of this essential element adds greatly to the clarity and the humour of that delightful composition.

By way of supplement to the stylistic evidence for the dating of the temple, Miss Lucy Talcott has contributed a catalogue of a mass of fragmentary pottery found in association with chips from the working of its marble. A lower limit in the neighborhood of 450 B. C. is established for the vases and the ostraca; this must be taken as an upper limit for the date of the marble work on the temple.

Combining this new chronological evidence with that available from the architectural and sculptural style, and from astronomical calculations, Dinsmoor arrives at the date 449-444 B. C. for the temple. It thus takes first place ahead of the three other known works by this same master, viz. the Temple of Poseidon at Sunium, of Ares in the Athenian Agora, of Themis at Rhamnus. Its beginning, moreover, would appear to ante-date by a couple of years that of the Parthenon and hence arises the question as to which of the two architects is to be credited with the invention of the ambulatory form of interior colonnade. Dinsmoor assigns the credit to Ictinus who was probably well advanced in the stone-work of his scheme at Bassae and in the paper-planning of a similar design for the Parthenon before the Hephaestion master had finally decided on the use of an interior colonnade of any sort.

This book makes no pretence to being a complete monograph on the Hephaestion. It is intended, moreover, for the specialist; the layman may well be frightened away by the extremely detailed presentation of the evidence, by the intricacy of the technical discussion, and by the amount of "scaffolding" left around the argument. Yet it is through unremitting attention to minutiae that the author achieves his chief results which are, first to illustrate more vividly than has hitherto been done the actual working out of the design of a great classical building and, secondly, to provide a secure basis for the study of the interrelations among the architects and the building projects of the fifth century. In this way Dinsmoor has recovered from the stones themselves much of that human quality which in the case of the architecture of other great periods, e.g. the Italian Renaissance, has always been accessible to the students through contemporary literary evidence.

Readers who may resent the delay occasioned by this study to the appearance of the author's long promised "Periclean Architects" may console themselves with the anticipation of a much richer prize.

HOMER A. THOMPSON.

ROYAL CANADIAN NAVAL VOLUNTEER RESERVE,
LONDON, ENGLAND.

AXEL W. PERSSON. *The Religion of Greece in Prehistoric Times.* Berkeley and Los Angeles, Univ. of California Press, 1942. Pp. 189; frontispiece; 10 plates; 29 text figures. (*Sather Classical Lectures*, XVII.)

This book consists of an Introduction and six chapters (I: Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and Its Survival in Classical Myth; II: Minoan-Mycenaean Signet Rings and the Vegetation Cycle; III: Death and Resurrection—Offering and Festivals; IV: Minoan-Mycenaean Re-

ligion Compared with the Religions of Asia Minor, Syria, Babylonia, and Egypt; V: Minoan-Mycenaean Survivals in the Greek Religion of Classical Times; VI: The Vegetation Cycle and the Nordic Religion of the Bronze Age—Summary). Persson thus has synthesized in these lectures the ideas of which he had already given some notice in his reports on the excavations of Asine and Dendra, as well as in several articles (*Arch. f. Religionswiss.* [1922]; *Dragma Nilsson* [1939]). It was inevitable that he should traverse much the same field which Nilsson covered so admirably in his four books (*Minoan-Mycenaean Religion* [1927]; *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* [1932]; *Homer and Mycenae* [1933]; *Greek Popular Religion* [1940]) and that he should be compelled repeatedly to take issue with the views of his compatriot.

Persson is known for his facility and boldness in combining what to many persons appear as disparate things. The chapter headings show clearly that he has a preconceived thesis to defend. Discussion starts with the charge that the gold signet rings of the Aegaeon period of civilization have never received their due interpretation (p. 7). Quoting from Evans' statements about the tree and pillar cult, he objects to this scholar's contention about the more permanent character of the sacred tree, because, he contends, on the rings we are dealing with deciduous trees. Yet he himself recognizes cypresses on two rings (pp. 63, 64, 78). In this connection it is perhaps worth while to quote Buerchner (*R.-E.*, XI, col. 1738), who names as Cretan trees of antiquity: palms, cypresses, cedars (all evergreen), black poplars, plane trees, and oaks (these last apparently mostly of the evergreen variety). Nor can it be proved, I think, that a leafless tree had no divinity in it.

In discussing the importance of prehistoric myths, Persson is led into a lengthy interpretation of the Glaucus-Polyidus story. In this tale he discovers correctly an obscure reminiscence of a prehistoric, crude embalming in honey, but he is further led to find evidence of Mycenaean mummification also in the strange preservation of one of the bodies from shaft grave V. It is true that Schliemann himself felt reminded of Egyptian mummies; it is also true that Mau (*R.-E.*, V, col. 2113) has anticipated all that Persson adduces for his view, including the interpretation of the Glaucus myth. Still so acute an observer as Schuchhardt completely ignores this feature in his book on Schliemann's excavations. Karo, too (*R.-E.*, XVI, s. v. "Mykenai"), is silent about this singular phenomenon. Nor can I explain why this alleged mummification was apparently restricted to one only of the nineteen persons buried here. The picture as given in Persson's book, finally, shows that only the face of the corpse is really well preserved, a fact which I ascribe to the gold mask which covered it (cf. also Schuchhardt, *loc. cit.*, p. 288). Persson himself acknowledges the fairy-tale, or as he says, the saga character of the Glaucus story. This should have prevented him from attaching any significance to the meaning of the names Glaucus and Polyidus, whose very transparency proves that they were given to the originally nameless heroes of the tale at a much later, Greek-speaking, time. The insight into the fairy-tale character should also have prevented him from seeking the "original meaning" in the sudden death of vegetation and its revival (here he follows Head, *Cat. Greek Coins, Lydia*, pp. 111 ff.). Neither can I agree with Persson in his further

speculations on Glaucus of Anthedon, in whose composite shape he discovers something to prove Minoan-Mycenaean origin—is then the *Halios Geron* from the Acropolis likewise Minoan-Mycenaean?—, and of Potniae.

When our author commences in Chap. II the detailed discussion of the gold rings, altogether 28, we shall have to grant him that here the archaeologist has the deciding voice. All the more is it to be regretted that Persson treats all his documents as if they were of the same level. We must of course concede that all these engravings are of a purely Minoan character. For all that, it is hard for me to believe that the rings from the Greek mainland (there are 15 of certain provenance, no. 6 is probably also continental, no. 17 is in Athens and thus likely to be so, while one is from Smyrna, but of doubtful authenticity; and only 10 belong to Crete) should not, on a more penetrating analysis, show peculiarities of their own. The excavations at Boeotian Thebes (*R.-E.*, V A, col. 1436) have shown that at least a ceramic industry was carried on in connection with the palace. Should not similar industries have been carried on in Mycenae (cf. Persson himself, p. 75)? And if so, may we not assume that the artists worked to order and expressed definite Mycenaean views? That transcends the scope of this review, however.

The rings are arranged in groups: Winter (1-6), Spring (7-19), Summer and Harvest Time (20-24), and a group without title, which I will call Departure Scenes. The common tie connecting these groups in Persson's opinion is the Vegetation Cycle. The first group deals with death or mourning, except the last two numbers, an ecstatic dance and a scene which Persson explains as sun magic. Group 2 is composed of several undoubted epiphany scenes (7, 8, 15, 16, perhaps also 9 and 17). This group is assigned to spring time, evidently on the strength of what Persson calls the "scanty foliage" (7). But on 10 he himself recognizes "relatively rich" foliage and on 11 he sees a naked bough, hardly appropriate to spring time. In the same way the "boughs" on 12 appear to be leafless, yet coupled with dense foliage on the tree at the right. I cannot accept Persson's interpretation of the segmented lines as an indication of grass. Rings 13 and 14 will be discussed later, while there is absolutely no apparent reason to assign 18 and 19 (bull games) to this season. The third group of 5 rings is assigned to summer and harvest because of its fully grown foliage (but cf. 2 and 3 of the winter cycle) and the large rayed sun. I cannot discover the "bow" in the god's right hand nor is the right the natural hand for holding the bow. The interpretation of ring 21, as against Nilsson's secular one, appears to be correct. I should like to go even farther than our author; for I believe I can see here the well-known wedding gesture of "*cheir' epi karpō*." Ring 22, the famous large ring from Mycenae, receives new explanations of details. Chief among these is the statement, obviously correct, that neither the double axe nor the palladium figure is floating in the air, but that the latter is appended to a fixed standard and the former is likewise fixed, either on the ground or on a temple wall (see also Herkenrath in *A. J. A.*, XLI [1937], p. 412; rightly reinforced by ring 23). The existence of this wall becomes evident from the six crania at the left, which I think are also to be taken as hung on this wall. Just as acceptable is the explanation of the wavy lines below sun and moon

as an adaptation to the round of the separating band on Minoan friezes. Whether we can agree with the author when he sees in the ring "a graphic picture of the great shrine at Mycenae" is not so certain, though in this Herkenrath (*loc. cit.*, p. 413: *man ist versucht von mykenischem Realismus zu sprechen*) seems to agree. On the other hand, Persson's interpretation of the two small beings seems to me erroneous. The one at the left does not stand on "rocky terrain," but rather on a hill or mountain (cf. the well-known "mistress of the mountain" gem). We must also take notice of the difference in the dress: neither figure wears the "harem skirt"; it resembles rather the dress of the "mistress" and in its voluminousness reminds me of the bell shaped idols. I also doubt, with Herkenrath, that the figurine at the right is engaged in plucking fruit from the tree. The seated woman I take with most interpreters to be a goddess. That she appears to be taller than the standing figures is an optic illusion (the measurements on the photograph in Persson are: 33, 34, 36 mm. respectively). Of ring 24, which certainly represents an indoors scene, Persson offers a startlingly new interpretation. He thinks the dress of the seated woman is made of hide, presumably on account of the dots on it, though similar dots appear on the dress of the seated woman on ring 22. Instead of garlanded poles, he sees a "possibly" small cypress on ringed bases (these even a magnifying glass failed to reveal to me); he also sees in the scene not merely the offering of a libation of the first wine of the season, but "not entirely impossible" a type of sacramental mystery, an explanation which he supports by the animal names used in the Mithras mysteries!

Let us now return to rings 13 and 14. On the former, three persons in flounced skirts, but not of the harem skirt type, and with their upper bodies naked, are adoring a sanctuary. Persson is quite right in claiming for them male sex, as their overdeveloped musculature proves. On ring 14, the technique of which is convincingly explained, and the general appearance of which bears a close resemblance to no. 13, we can still recognize skirts with vertical pleats and the oversized female breast. These two rings give Persson an opportunity for far-reaching and fine-spun speculations. In the skirted males he sees eunuchs, predecessors of the *galloi*, in the women representatives of the tribe of Amazons (pp. 90, 110). For to him amputation of one breast in the female represents the same religious character as castration does in the male. The two operations are then (pp. 106 ff.) compared to the cult of Cybele and Attis, while the Amazons, whose name contains for Persson a "transparent" etymology (p. 112), cut off their breasts and offered them to fortify the nutritive power of the Great Goddess, who is identified (p. 145) with the Ephesian Artemis, whose high priest was a eunuch. Most astonishing here is the metamorphosis of the harvest or wine goddess on ring 24 into a "high priest" (p. 146). As for the Amazons, in Fimmen's *Kretisch-Mykenische Kultur*, figure 396j, a Cretan carnel shows a woman archer, with thickened thighs and displaying only one breast, though nobody has here seen anything but a lack of artistic skill. I confess that I cannot see the resemblance between religious castration and the mutilation of the breast. Certainly, we can understand the fertility and fertilization idea in the former, particularly if we remember that the *membrum virile*

was buried in the earth. But we know of nothing similar in regard to the mutilation of the Amazons. In fact, I think that the whole story is purely due to an attempt at etymologizing and has no religious significance whatever.

We must yet say a word about rings 25-29. The last of these is strongly suspect, owing to its peculiar provenance (p. 102), and Persson's own discussion seems to show that he considers it a forgery. The other rings have in common the departure of a ship. The first has been interpreted by von Salis (*Theseus und Ariadne*, pp. 27 ff.) as probably belonging to this myth. The same scholar has discussed ring 26, on whose authenticity he casts some doubts. Be that as it may, the rings certainly present scenes in which a goddess takes a part. Yet it seems to me far-fetched to draw, as Persson does, on the analogy of the rock engravings of Bohus for parallels. At the most we may claim that similar circumstances produce similar conceptions. But it seems to be very tenuous to carry these comparisons into such details as Persson does.

These observations on details may enable the reader to judge the reviewer's opinion of the book as a whole. That the Minoan religion had as one of its principal figures a great nature goddess, that male divinities play a distinctly minor part, and that the Great Goddess was a divinity of all nature, these are commonplaces of Minoan studies. To Persson's treatment, however, I would apply the words of B. Schweitzer (*Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1928, p. 6): the unstable basis on which a history of Greek religion has to build is probably responsible for the fact that the investigator's disposition and general view, his interest and his special field largely determine his presentation. The book gives me the impression that Persson's intensive study of a group of gold rings, together with his conception of a "vegetation cycle," has closed his eyes to all objections and obstacles. For, of course, these 28 rings are not the only ones with religious subjects on their bezels. They cannot be considered by themselves without giving them their place among the numerous seal impressions. I am also disturbed by the well-known fact that the rings are of so small a diameter that they barely fit the finger of a small woman's hand. Yet as far as I can ascertain they were found indiscriminately in the graves of men and of women. Were they then burial gifts from loving wives or daughters? Or were they worn on a string? Since some of them show unmistakable signs of active use in sealing, it is unlikely that they were worn as amulets. Yet the religious character of the scenes,—for this remains even if we deduct all those which have been declared to be secular—, seems little appropriate for practical use.

The arrangement adopted by Persson for his discussion is at first blush a very plausible one. Winter, the time of death, followed by resurrection toward, and during, Spring, Summer for maturing and harvest, and finally with the death of vegetation the departure of the vegetation goddess. If only the climatic conditions of Greece and the islands supported such a division. I cannot do better than refer to Nilsson (*"Die eleusinischen Gottheiten," Arch. f. Religionswiss.*, 1935, p. 105): Greece has no four months of rest time for vegetation. The crops start from the seeds immediately after the fall rains, grow and are green the whole winter, except for two or three weeks in January, when their growth is slowed or stopped. The rest period,

when the vegetation is dead, lasts from the end of May to October. A glance at the climatological tables given by Buerehner (*R.-E.*, XI, cols. 1736, 1737) seems to bear this out. If it should be objected that the author is dealing with the tree cult, such objection is invalidated by his own arguments on pages 155, 162-3. But even without regard to the climate, do the pithoi of the rings really point to burials and the death of vegetation? Fimmen (*loc. cit.*, p. 64) says: pithos burials have been found in Crete only exceptionally; in Phylacopi on Melos they are limited to children; they are more frequent on the mainland (Sphoungaras, mentioned by Persson, p. 13, is also isolated). It is true that rings 1 and 3 are ascribed to Vaphio, but ring 2 is said to come from Phaestus. And though the pithos burial of Glaucus, the *child*, is not so unlikely, do the scenes of the rings give any indication about a child's tomb? Or, indeed, about any tomb? On ring 1 the gesture of the kneeling woman may be claimed as one of mourning, but not so that of the man on 2 and 3. In short, I fear that Persson has been carried away by his pre-conception.

As one would expect from the rich storehouse of Persson's knowledge, there are many *à propos aperçus* on related topics, not all of them convincing: pithoigia, p. 18; snake as symbol of water, p. 20; eyes and ear, p. 88; Palladium, p. 91; Cybele and the double axe, p. 105; Achaean translations from the Cretan, p. 127; Aphaia connected with aphanes, p. 129; etymology of Rhea, p. 141; Despoina = virgin, *ibid.*; original significance of Thea and Theos in Eleusis, p. 151; Apollo = the sun, *ibid.* To refute these in detail would unduly expand this review.

To sum up: we should be grateful to our author for the intensive study he has bestowed on a group of monuments which certainly deserve it. But this reviewer at least cannot accept the conclusion to which Persson's study has led him. We can only express the hope that his attempt may lead an archaeologist and a student of ancient religion to join hands in re-investigating the whole series of religious seal engravings and impressions. It is a pleasure to handle the book because it is so well printed. A few errata have nevertheless slipped in. Why is the seer called now Polyidos, now Polyidas? On p. 100 we read *temenoi* as plural of *temenos* and on p. 134 the reference should be to figure 24, not 27.

ERNST RIESS.

SCARSDALE, N. Y.

LAURENCE LEE HOWE. *The Pretorian Prefect from Commodus to Diocletian* (A. D. 180-305). Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1942. Pp. xiii + 141.

Proceeding on the sound assumption that an accurate picture of the pretorian prefecture as an institution must rest both upon a study of the kind of men who held that office, their activities and competence *de jure* and *de facto*, as well as upon a correlation of their activities *qua personae* with "the general history of the times, in order to show how the prefecture affected and was affected by the total political situation," the work under review presents a list of the pretorian prefects and a discussion of their military and civil

powers and of the history and influence of the prefecture for the third century. Eight special problems in connection with this subject are treated in an Appendix.

The author confines himself to the third century because in it the prefect of the pretorian guard was virtually vice-emperor with authority in the widest sphere of activity and because of the misconception which had enjoyed some currency that in this period the office was changed from a purely military institution "into an office in which the judicial and ministerial elements predominated, and which remained thus until Constantine finally deprived it of all military powers and made it a purely civil position." Marcel Durry (*Les cohortes prétoriennes* [Paris, 1938]) and A. Passerini (*Le Coorti Pretorie* [Rome, 1939]) had already indicated the falsity of the position that under Septimius Severus the prefecture had lost its military character and had become preëminently a judicial office. (But it is not correct to state as a recent reviewer of Howe's work does, *C. W.*, XXXVI (1943), p. 223, that "the overwhelming majority of the prefects were soldiers.") Howe amplifies and refines the evidence which corrects our conception of the pretorian prefecture.

The great merit of Howe's book, in the opinion of this reviewer, is his independent and painstaking work in giving us a list of the pretorian prefects of certain office and dates, and a list of the prefects who clearly held office, but whose dates are uncertain. The evidence for their incumbency and for their careers is fully marshalled, cautiously evaluated, and clearly presented. Of equal value is his work in pruning from the roster of pretorian prefects carried by earlier scholars, even in the latest list of Passerini, those for whom there is little or no acceptable evidence. The *Augustan History*, which gives many names of pretorian prefects, is shown to be of uneven value as a source. The Lives from Commodus to Macrinus inclusive yield names supported by evidence from other sources, while the material from the Lives of Elagabalus through Balbinus and Pupienus is less reliable, and the names from the last part are, in the majority of cases, purely fictitious.

Strictures on the prosopographical part of Howe's study are of a minor nature. Tarrutenius (or Tarruntenus?) Paternus did not retire from office (p. 65), but Commodus *summovit* him (*Vita Comm.*, 4, 7), and if, as he does, Howe applies the statement that none of Commodus' pretorian prefects held office more than three years (*Vita Comm.*, 14, 8) to T. Longaeus Rufus, then he should also hold it true in the case both of Paternus and Perrenis, especially since he feels that the latter was appointed by Commodus, as against Stein (*R.-E.*, VI, col. 952) who argues that he was appointed by M. Aurelius. Howe does not reconcile or explain the statements that Flavius Juvenalis was the third prefect of Julianus (*Vita Sev.*, 6, 5) and that Julianus had chosen Veturius Macrinus as his third prefect (*Vita Jul.*, 7, 4).

On the vexing question of the date of Ulpian's death and on the chronology of the prefectures of Domitius Honoratus and Aedinius Julianus, there is little that is compelling in Howe's argument in Appendix II C. The present reviewer is inclined to the view that Ulpian's death must be placed later than 223, which Howe feels is the probable date (p. 104), and would suggest 227. Ulpian was still in office when the pretorians complained of Dio's severe

military discipline in Upper Pannonia (Dio, LXXX, 4, 2). Dio could hardly have been in Pannonia in 223, since, in summarizing the events of his life between 222 and his appointment as consul in 229 (Dio, LXXX, 1, 3), he tells us that he went from Asia to Bithynia, fell sick there, then went to his province of Africa, returned to Italy, was sent out first as governor of Dalmatia, and then of Upper Pannonia. It is not likely that these events took place in one year. Furthermore, Dio connects the complaints against him to Ulpian with the lax discipline of the Roman armies in the face of a threat to Mesopotamia and Syria by the Persian Artaxerxes. Danger to these areas became imminent after Artaxerxes' decisive victory over the Parthians, on April 28, 227 (Parker, *Roman World*, p. 111).

Passerini's assumption that Domitius Honoratus was made a colleague of Ulpian after Ulpian had caused the death of Flavianus and Chrestus is not to be rejected as a possibility because Dio and Zosimus do not mention a colleague at the time of Ulpian's death. There is no clear evidence that Ulpian remained sole prefect until the time of his death. If the pretorian prefect Domitius Honoratus is identical, as seems likely, with the prefect of Egypt of that name and the L. Domitius Honoratus of the *Album* of Canusium, his pretorian prefecture must be placed in 223. But it does not follow that his appointment was possible because Ulpian had been killed; Domitius Honoratus was, as Passerini suggests, in all probability made Ulpian's colleague. When Epagathus (presumably) brought about Ulpian's death "not long after"—a vague phrase in a summary account which certainly can be extended to a period of four or five years, that is, to 227—Ulpian had disposed of Flavianus and Chrestus, it is equally possible that Aedinius Julianus was made Honoratus' colleague. If Aedinius Julianus is the same man as M. Aedinius Julianus, prefect of Egypt in 223, his pretorian prefecture must come later than that date. To identify him further with the M. Aedinius Julianus, *legatus pro praetore* in Gaul (*C. I. L.*, XIII, 3162—at the latest 220), we must assume that he was adlected into the senate (possibly by Elagabalus "under whom all things were possible to them that believed," as Howe wittily remarks) before he was prefect of Egypt. This would explain why he (assuming that we are concerned with the same man) appears as senator in the *Album* of Canusium, which is dated in 223. The fact that Epagathus was ostensibly sent out to be prefect of Egypt and killed on the way does not mean that there actually was a vacancy in that office at the time, nor that, if there was a vacancy, it was caused by Honoratus' promotion to the pretorian prefecture.

Less satisfactory than the prosopographical part of the work is the author's interpretation of the constitutional position of the prefect of the pretorian guard. His desire to find evidence for constitutional delegation of wide powers in the sphere of military, judicial, and administrative competence causes him to make statements which are saved from being false only by a qualifying word or phrase.

Consider, for example, the following quotation (p. 40):

"The most reasonable explanation of the constitutional position of the pretorian prefect is that he acted at all times *vice principis*. In that capacity there is no doubt that he was given

special delegations of power which—up to that time, at least—had not formed a part of the regular authority of the prefecture. But this does not mean that the prefecture itself possessed no regular and permanent powers; nor does it mean that in many, if not in most, cases these delegations were not significant for the future. We may consider the pretorian prefect either a magistrate having *imperium* in his own right or as a mere channel through which the emperor exercised his *imperium*; but in either case the prefecture was an office with regular authority."

The last clause, "but in either case the prefecture was an office with regular authority," is inane. The prefect's "regular" authority was his function as head of the pretorian guard. The question is whether the pretorian prefect as such had an *imperium* independent of the emperor covering a general military, a general judicial, or a general administrative province other than this, or whether in matters outside of his prefecture of the pretorian guard *per se* he was "a mere channel through which the emperor exercised his *imperium*." All the evidence supports the second position. His extra competence came to him by special delegation of the emperor, to an officer of ability and wide experience and near at hand.

There is no indisputable evidence for a general *de jure* grant of military power to the pretorian prefect. Many special delegations of wide *de facto* military power may be adduced. But Dio's speech of Maecenas and the resentment of the senate indicate that such grants were considered an encroachment upon the domain of the senate, which would not have been the case if an *imperium* had been granted the prefect. To employ in the field experienced officers of eminent rank, as our commander-in-chief president employs the officers of the army and the navy, is quite different from granting them independent *de jure* authority.

Howe's difficulty in establishing the exact constitutional position of the pretorian prefect was the difficulty of this reviewer in making a similar study of the prefect of Egypt. There was for that official, as for the pretorian prefect, abundant evidence of *de facto* competence in a wide range of military, judicial, and administrative duties, but little or no evidence of a *de jure* grant of general powers within these spheres independent of the will of the emperor. The *de facto* exercise of authority overflowed the *de jure* container. No matter how great the power, how extensive the jurisdiction, the emperor was the source of the authority, not in the sense of having granted a wide *imperium* which he might capriciously withdraw, but in the sense of permitting the exercise of powers which of right belonged to him.

And it is the opinion of this writer that the emperors "planned it that way." An inevitable result of increasing absolutism in the third century was to widen the scope of the *de facto* powers of the agents of that absolutism. By and large the position of any official in the hierarchy of the bureaucracy of imperial Rome was that of a "hand" of the emperor, whose range of activity was widened or narrowed by special delegation of the emperor. With respect to the pretorian prefects in the third century, there is no evidence that they received a constitutional grant to act *vice principis* throughout the empire, that they had a general delegation to act as commander-

in-chief of all Roman forces, that the emperor "had delegated an original civil jurisdiction" to them, in short that the broad powers which they enjoyed in this period were *ex officio* inherent in the office they held.

The promise to trace the development of the prefecture "not uninfluenced by the general political situation" is not as fully carried out as one might wish, and the social and economic milieu in which the development took place is almost totally disregarded.

Dr. Howe's work, then, in the opinion of this reviewer, is to be highly commended for its original and valuable work on the prefects of the pretorian guard and their careers. The treatment of their powers and of the development of the prefecture is less successful.

There are a selective bibliography, Latin and English, and Greek Indices. The following typographical errors, certainly an almost irreducible minimum, were noted: p. 45, "sone" for "some"; p. 94, "prefereable"; p. 99, "Ziphilinus" for "Xiphilinus" and on the same page the misplaced accent *καισραρείου*.

O. W. REINMUTH.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

H. J. ROSE. *The Eclogues of Vergil*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, The Univ. of California Press, 1942. Pp. viii + 276. (*Sather Classical Lectures*, XVI.)

The present volume represents lectures delivered during 1939-1940 at the University of California on the well-known Sather foundation. The author, who is Professor of Greek in the University of St. Andrews, brings to the interpretation of the *Eclogues* a mature scholarly life which has been devoted in the main to the study of Greek Mythology, the primitive cultures of Greece and Rome, Roman literature, and other aspects of Classical antiquity. It is not easy for one now writing of the *Eclogues* to contribute anything very new, but the background which Professor Rose commands is most likely to yield important results.

The book contains eight chapters, which discuss, successively, the pastoral before Vergil; the famous description *molle atque facetum*, which Horace applies to Vergil's style; the poet and his home; the poet and his friends; Gallus, Silenus, and Arkady; Vergil and allegory; the Theocritean imitations; the fourth Eclogue, in great detail. These are arresting topics which lend great interest to the book at the outset. By deliberate choice Rose omits such highly technical subjects as meter and style. The chief purpose of the lectures is best stated in the writer's own words, namely, to consider "the genesis of the poems and their worth as literature and as documents throwing light on the mind of a lovable man and on the currents of opinion, hope, and fear which set this way and that in an age as troubled as our own and no less anxious for a happy issue out of its afflictions." One gladly recalls the cheering experience of the late Warde Fowler, who, during the course of the first world war, gained so much hope and courage from reading the *Aeneid*. Many a reader of Vergil can add his own experience to that of Rose and Fowler.

The chief contribution made by Professor Rose to the interpretation of the *Eclogues* is found in his critical analysis of the various opinions entertained by his predecessors, that is, in his clearing away of inadequate conceptions of Vergilian workmanship, and, to no little extent, in eliminating a good deal that is mere rubbish. This is done in a positive but courteous manner and in the light of independent research of the writer's own. On the positive side there are a good many results subject to question.

The first chapter, dealing with the pastoral before Vergil, considers the usual names—Sophron, Theocritus and his contemporaries, Bion, Moschus, and Vergil himself. Here a proper but uncommon emphasis is given to the comparatively small reading public to which Vergil appealed, an audience that consequently was highly educated and capable of appreciating hints and allusions that are now probably lost to us. This made for political influence in Rome, as Rose insists, and, it may be added, for a high grade of poetry.

Rose interprets *molle atque facetum*, as applied by Horace to the *Eclogues*, to mean "flexible and humorous," but observes that this expression has a literature all its own, because its precise meaning is left very uncertain. This is a case in which definite meaning is lost to the modern reader which may very well have been perfectly clear to Horace.

In his interesting discussion of the location of Vergil's early home Rose joins the company of Nardi, Conway, and Rand, all of whom recently have devoted a good deal of hard study to the subject. Rose appeals mainly to *Eclogues* I and IX, with some reference to the topography of III, V, and VII. On literary and historical grounds he argues with some plausibility that Tityrus of I cannot be Vergil, if for no other reason, as he thinks, than the fact that Tityrus is an aged slave who has just received his freedom.¹ More convincing is his demonstration that the estate of *Eclogue* I cannot be near Mantua, because Mantuan territory is too flat and with too few hills to suit the description. To solve this difficulty Rose advances a new idea. First, he sides with Rand as against Conway in believing that Vergil's old home was near Old Pietole. Then, the estate of *Eclogue* IX is probably an additional farm that Vergil's father owned, but of unknown location. Where, then, was the estate of *Eclogue* I? Rose answers (pp. 62 f., 122) that it was probably in the foothills of the Brescian Alps, a district that Vergil had come to know early in life because his parents may have sent him there in

¹ Tityrus is presumably a slave in III, 96, V, 12, and IX, 23-5; but in VI, 3-5, he is Vergil. Since most of these shepherds and goatherds were slaves (add Corydon of *Ecl.* II; cf. note 10, *infra*), that argument in itself cannot be applied against Tityrus as Vergil in I. Menalcas is Vergil in V, 86 f. I am tempted to suggest that in *Ecl.* I Tityrus is represented as well advanced in years because the poem heads the list of the *Eclogues* and was probably the last to receive its final form, whereas in the earlier poems (III, V, VI, IX) where Tityrus appears he is an assistant to the shepherds, and therefore fairly young. At length he gains his freedom and so we find him appropriately in I. Rose does not attempt to decide the order in which Vergil composed the poems (see p. 251), but he thinks they were produced during 42-39 (p. 223, n. 26) and probably published in the period 39-38 (p. 251: Excursus). He thinks that I is comparatively late.

the summer for the sake of his health! Here, too, Vergil could find beech trees, which Rand was unable to locate in the vicinity of Mantua and which Rose likewise requires. Here would be deer and wolves, perchance. Throughout this part of his discussion Rose properly insists that we need high, rocky territory in the main, but his second conclusion cannot be accepted. I shall return to this problem later in the review.

The following chapter (IV) discusses Octavian of *Eclogue* I; Pollio of III, IV, and VIII; Gallus of VI and X; Varus of VI and IX. This naturally leads to the question of "masks" in the *Eclogues* and to sharp criticism of the extreme view of Herrmann, who has tried to show that all the characters in the poems represent members of a literary clique or other society. Rose's conclusion is that at the time when Vergil was composing the *Eclogues* Pollio was scarcely known to him, and Varus was an uncongenial acquaintance merely. Vergil knew Octavian from early school days. At Naples Vergil became acquainted with Siro and Philodemus. In this connection Rose believes that Vergil may have written some of the *Catalepton*, such as VI and VII, for instance; and possibly other poems not now preserved.

The study of *Eclogues* VI and VIII leads to the consideration of Gallus' relations with Vergil, the significance of Silenus in VI, and the question whether Vergil is dealing with a literal or figurative Arcadia. The lay of Silenus may, or may not, indicate Vergil's reactions to Epicureanism, and the evolutionary doctrine here proclaimed may be partly literary, with no suggestion of Vergil's personal view. In *Eclogue* X Gallus, pining in love, is in an idealized Arcadia; but the local descriptive touches, although capable of being applied to South Italy or Sicily, may equally well refer to Arcadia in Greece. Vergil wrote this poem in a serious vein to console Gallus wherever he was at the time. The poem is a reply to a literary challenge which Gallus had earlier sent Vergil.

Chapter VI brings us to the problem of allegory in the *Eclogues*, which has been the playground of countless writers beginning with the post-Servian Roman commentators. Rose finds no allegory in V, but in I and IX there is a measure of allegory. Rose takes the view that, by and large, Vergil does not resort to allegory in the *Eclogues*. When he speaks of Daphnis in V, for instance, he means the famous legendary shepherd of Arcadia; Daphnis is simply Daphnis (p. 134).

A chapter on Theocritean imitations now follows, in which, first, *Eclogue* VII is compared with Theocritus (?) VIII. Rose finds Vergil less successful in composing a natural poem than Theocritus, because the shepherd of VII is too learned. This chapter is the least satisfactory in the book; and if one wishes to get an adequate picture of the literary relationship of Vergil to Theocritus one can do no better than turn to the able presentation of Prescott.²

The final chapter is a lengthy study of *Eclogue* IV, in which Rose lists the chief difficulties of interpretation under four heads: the type of composition; the source of inspiration—whether Eastern or

² See *The Development of Virgil's Art*, pp. 76-117. Haywood, C. W., XXXVI (1942), pp. 89 f., offers a new interpretation for the opening of I, IV, VI, X, and the freedom of these poems from Theocritean influence.

Western; why a Golden Age should be expected at this particular time (41/40 B. C.); why the birth of a child is foretold, and who the child was. There is little that is new in this chapter, and one of the two contributions which Rose believes that he has made, namely, that this is a poem of birthday congratulation, cast in the future, had already been suggested in a valuable paper by Fr. Marx as early as 1898.³ He thinks that Vergil's picture of the Golden Age finds its closest parallel in Plato, *Politicus* 268 D ff. He regards the poem as a blending of several independent sources into a skilfully-wrought work of art.

These eight chapters are well documented with notes which cite many articles and some books that could easily be overlooked. Some publications, however, are neglected that would add to the value of the notes. In a discussion of Vergil's antecedents in the pastoral (Chap. I), one cannot afford to disregard Plato, who reflects so much pastoral background, particularly in the *Phaedrus*.⁴ For the subject of allegory (Chap. VI) there is value in the Chicago dissertation of Hamblin,⁵ as likewise in another Chicago dissertation by Hersman.⁶ Add to note 44, page 250 for *iynx*, Eugene Tavenner, "Iynx and Rhombus," *T. A. P. A.*, LXIV (1933), pp. 109-27. There is likewise much of value in the commentary on the *Eclogues* by Ettore Stampini (Torino, 1923), especially since he collects so many illustrations from Roman comedy, a field related to bucolic poetry.

As already indicated, a disappointing feature of the book is the discussion on pages 45-68, where Rose attempts to discover the local setting of *Eclogues* I and IX in the foothills of the Breseian Alps. He records (pp. 64 f.) the view of Frank, that most of Vergil's pastoral scenes are to be located in the vicinity of Naples,⁷ but caustically rejects this view on the ground that it casts doubt on Vergil's veracity and because the Neapolitan districts lack certain characteristics mentioned in the *Eclogues*, such as swampy (*sic*) ground and slow-flowing rivers. Finally, Rose holds the strange view that in the *Eclogues* "Vergil is describing adequately and accurately the country in which he was brought up" (p. 65). Does that mean that he was brought up in the foothills of the Breseian Alps? Rose's answer to that is that, since Vergil's father *may have had* two estates, one at Pietole (*Ecl.* I) and another at some different but unknown locality (*Ecl.* IX), his pictures in these two *Eclogues* are composite (p. 60). This is pure fancy, of course.

³ See *Neue Jahrbücher*, I (1898), pp. 105-28; cf. David M. Robinson, *A. J. P.*, LXII (1941), p. 367.

⁴ See Clyde Murley, "Plato's *Phaedrus* and Theocritean Pastoral," *T. A. P. A.*, LXXI (1940), pp. 281-95, who lists many parallel passages that suggest some influence of Plato on Theocritus. Euripides may have given some impetus to the pastoral through his *Cyclops* and the various characters that belong to the lower strata of life, such as the slave.

⁵ Frank Russell Hamblin, *The Development of Allegory in the Classical Pastoral* (Univ. of Chicago, 1929, written under the supervision of Professor Henry W. Prescott).

⁶ Anne Bates Hersman, *Studies in Greek Allegorical Interpretation* (Chicago, 1906), largely concerned with Plutarch but giving some attention to the early Greek writers.

⁷ Tenney Frank, *Vergil, A Biography*, pp. 112-15, 129 f.

For the answer to this question it is best to turn to Vergil himself. Since the *Eclogues* are concerned with neatherds, shepherds, and goatherds, it is natural to examine the *Georgics* for problems of geography. In a passage describing the nature of various soils, Vergil writes (*Georg.*, II, 195-202):

Sin armenta magis studium vitulosque tueri
aut ovium fetum aut urentis culta capellas,
saltus et saturi petito longinqua Tarenti
et qualem infelix amisit Mantua campum
pascentem niveos herboso flumine cyenos;
non liquidi gregibus fontes, non gramina deerunt,
et quantum longis carpent armenta diebus,
exigua tantum gelidus ros nocte reponet.

A fair interpretation of this passage would assign the sheep and goats to Tarentum, famous for its wool,⁸ while the cattle would be given to Mantua,⁹ which still can show fine specimens of these animals. This is the only place in the *Georgics* where Mantua is mentioned in connection with flocks; but other passages in this same poem describe the full rivers (*fluvii, flumina*), the banks green with grass and moss, caves, and the shade of overhanging rocks; see *Georg.*, III, 138-56. In this latter passage (146-56) there is a description of the gadfly of Campania or Lucania, which is found in the forest along the river Silarus. The logical inference is that Vergil is thinking of the droves of cattle in South Italy. In this same book (209-41) Vergil describes a bullfight in the famous Sila forest of Calabria, and again he mentions (213) the *mons* and *flumina lata*. Even the snakes against which he gives warning (416-49; cf. *Ecl.*, III, 92 f.) are in the Calabrian forests. Two vivid similes in the *Aeneid* (II, 304-8; XII, 521-5) describe this same rocky country of the shepherds, the second simile being modeled on two comparisons in the *Iliad*, in the first of which (*Il.*, IV, 275-9) a goatherd is mentioned, in the second (*Il.*, IV, 452-5) a shepherd. In *Aeneid*, IV, 68-73, the shepherd is said to frequent the wooded pasture lands on the hillsides (*nemora, silvas saltusque*; cf. *Georg.*, II, 197), with which we may compare *Eclogues*, II, 28-30, and VI, 56-60.

Horace bears similar witness when he mentions the *armenta* of Calabria (*Odes*, I, 31, 5 f.), the *capreae* of Apulia (*Odes*, I, 33, 7 f.), the *pecudes* of Lucania and Calabria (*Epodes*, I, 27 f.; *Epist.*, II, 2, 177 f.), and the *oves* of Tarentum (*Odes*, II, 6, 10). His wealthy friend Grosphus, the knight, kept great herds of cattle and sheep in Sicily (*Odes*, II, 16, 33 f.; cf. Vergil, *Ecl.*, II, 21 f.). Vergil and Horace together thus tell us that the districts where cattle, sheep, and goats were to be found were central Italy, Campania, Calabria, Lucania, Apulia, with Tarentum especially prominent in the sheep industry.

⁸ Horace, *Odes*, II, 6, 10; Varro, *De Re Rustica*, II, 2, 18; Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, V, pp. 164 f.; Rand, *The Magical Art of Virgil*, pp. 75 f.

⁹ For the lush grass illustrating Vergil's description, as it can be seen between Milano and Cremona today, see Rand, *In Quest of Virgil's Birthplace*, pp. 14-16; cf. the same writer's *The Magical Art of Virgil*, pp. 237 f.

From the economic point of view cattle were raised in Umbria, Etruria, Latium, Campania, and the Apennines (Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*, V, pp. 162 f.). Sheep and goats were found in Italy generally and in the Po Valley, but Mantua is not mentioned (Frank, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 346, 362, 367, 374; V, pp. 116, 137, 163-6, 184, 199-204). Cattle, sheep, and goats were highly important in Sicily (Scramuzza in Frank, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 278-80, 351 f.; Frank, *op. cit.*, V, p. 293; Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, pp. 194-7, with notes), and in North Africa (Haywood in Frank, *op. cit.*, IV, pp. 24, 52, 81; Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, pp. 276, 290). Such herds and flocks were tended largely by slaves, who, in the majority of cases, were Greeks or other slave classes.¹⁰

Vergil, Horace, and the sources of economic history all lead us to believe that the habitat of cattle, sheep, and goats at the time when Vergil was writing was to be found largely in the hilly districts of central and southern Italy, and in Sicily. Accordingly, Frank's view, that at least some of the *Eclogues* imply the territory about Naples, should be expanded to include South Italy as well—also Sicily. Donatus (p. 3, Brummer) informs us that Vergil, while still in Rome, made frequent visits to Campania and Sicily. His mission on such trips was probably to study the shepherd life of those districts. Since all Italy and all Sicily were Roman possessions in Vergil's day, and since the flocks were owned by Romans but tended by slaves and some peasants, perhaps, Vergil's shepherds are not necessarily any more Theocritean than Roman in origin. The servile uprisings in the last century of the Roman Republic, first in Sicily, later in South Italy, were caused by the many thousands of slaves on the great estates and ranches.

In spite of various objections to Rose's views, such as those mentioned, one can only welcome these stimulating lectures on the *Eclogues*, which will lead many a reader of Vergil to search again that he may discover new meanings and gain fresh inspiration from Rome's great interpreter of the Augustan Age.

E. L. HIGHBARGER.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

JANE ISABELLA MARION TAIT. *Philodemus' Influence on the Latin Poets*. Ann Arbor, Michigan, Edwards Brothers, Inc., Lithoprinters, 1941. Pp. v + 118.

This book reviews the Latin literature of the late first century B. C. from the point of view of Philodemus' influence on it besides discussing that influence on specific passages of the poets. I believe that most of us can profit, as I did, from reviewing the subject from that point of view in this competent little work. De Lacy has already called attention in his review to some of the difficulties raised in the account of literary history, so on that subject I shall only say

¹⁰ See Tenney Frank, *An Economic History of Rome*², pp. 57-9; M. Cary, *A History of Rome* (1938), pp. 259 f., 451 f., 561 f. See also note 1, *supra*.

that it seems more likely that the poets from Cisalpine Gaul became Alexandrians at Rome than that Cisalpine Gaul was a hotbed of Alexandrianism (pp. 35, 53, 111).

It is surprising to find the question of influence handled in an old-fashioned and unimaginative way. Probably anyone who undertakes such a study tends to think of the process more and more as something like an economist's collecting figures to turn into statistics, and in fact that point of view seems to grow on the author as the work proceeds, until on p. 87 we find, "It is not surprising that Philodemus was used as a source-book by those writers who had some point of contact with him as contemporaries." To call him their source without qualification gives a wrong impression. It is true that some of their ideas or conceits probably originated in his epigrams, as Miss Tait shows, but poets, at least these poets, are not crows collecting bits of colored glass in their nests. The poet is a mother and an obstetrician, and the poem passes through the stages of conception, gestation, and delivery. Their contacts with Philodemus occasionally resulted in their becoming pregnant with poems which displayed their paternal parentage. This is not meant as a witticism. One only needs to read the epigrams and the poems influenced by them to see how large a part the second poet played in his product and that that product generally is much superior. Miss Tait's discussion of certain poems shows that she is aware of this principle, but in general the other attitude prevails.

In some cases the parallels are pushed too hard. It is impossible to say (p. 43) that Catullus, 13 did not arise from *A. P.*, XI, 44, but the differences should be taken into account. There certainly is not the "same undercurrent of friendly effrontery." There is more wit and life in Catullus' piece, and no unpleasant suggestion of toadying.

The remark about Horace that "His lack of imagination kept him comfortably in line with the old Republican mores" sounds like the so-called sophistication of the 1920's (p. 64). It is far-fetched to say that Horace's disclaiming the value of a high ranking mistress in *Sat.*, I, 2, recalls *A. P.*, V, 132, or that the scene at the end of that satire is in a style which recalls the dramatic pieces of Philodemus (p. 64), or that Horace's acquaintance with contemporary Epicureanism is any evidence of the influence of Philodemus (pp. 67-8), or that *Odes*, I, 20, follows the theme of *A. P.*, XI, 44.

RICHARD M. HAYWOOD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Remains of Old Latin. Newly Edited and Translated by E. H. WARMINGTON. Vol. III: Lucilius; The Twelve Tables. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1938. Pp. xxxiii + 550. (*Loeb Classical Library*.)

This excellent addition to the *Loeb Classical Library* has been available long enough to have proved its usefulness. It has received restrained and laudatory reviews at the hands of Fordyce,¹ Ullman,²

¹ *C. R.*, LIII (1939), pp. 187 f.

² *Class. Phil.*, XXXV (1940), pp. 217 f.

Kent,³ and Klotz.⁴ To their lists of misprints and minor errors may be added the following: P. x, line 7, read "conflict with so late a date as 148 if this . . ."; on the same page, line 10, the comma after "Lucilius" should be an apostrophe. P. xix, the second footnote should be *b*, not *d*. P. 22, line 2, read "cum" for "sum." P. 24, line 5: a misprint crept into Ullman's correction of "lucaretur"—the word should be "lurcaretur." P. 37, line 25, the reference should be to footnote *e*, not *c*. P. 72, note *a*, line 1, read "for," not "far." P. 73, line 16, read "frolic," for "folie." P. 207, raised *f* is omitted before third footnote. P. 310, apparatus, line 11, for raised figures "977" read "967." P. 330, line 17, read "pro" for "for." P. 359, note *a*, insert comma after "philosopher." P. 360, apparatus, line 8, read "1115" for "1116." P. 449, last line, raised letter "*f*" is omitted. P. 450, apparatus, line 4, delete comma after "in auct." P. 497, footnote, delete "a" before "Cicero." P. 524, second column, line 34, read "after 983-4."

It would be extraordinary if one did not find oneself in frequent disagreement with Warmington's interpretation of the fragments of Lucilius, and more especially with his attempts to reconstruct a continuity for the fragments within a particular satire. But on the whole he has put to a fairly conservative use the material which he has gleaned from the commentary of Marx, the books of Cichorius and Fiske, and numerous articles. If one feels now a lack and now an excess of imagination, one has only to try to improve on his reconstructions to see that it is much easier to disagree with him than it is to set him right. The alternative to his italic connecting lines would be a bare text, elucidated only with that which is fairly certain, and would be a book more difficult to read. Warmington at least gives us a starting-point for our own speculations, and no harm is done save to the unwary.

At line 124 (pp. 40 f.) Warmington's italic connecting line, his translation, and his footnote seem at variance with one another. If *cernuus* can mean "stooping" the line would seem to mean, "Forthwith he stooping shod her pretty feet"—a meaning which Warmington almost, but not quite, suggests. May the *fuscina fallaci cumulo* of line 223 (p. 70) refer to a basket with a false bottom, like a champagne bottle which bellies up in the bottom and so does not really hold as much as it seems to hold? At line 1236 (p. 402) "leaped again with the sound" overtranslates *resultabant* ("re-echoed" or "resounded"). It is hard to believe that Lucilius used *mugitu* for the sound of an anvil (Warmington's emendation at line 1266). The incorporation of the editor's gloss in his translation without any typographical warning is mildly disturbing (*Twelve Tables*, p. 447, lines 4-5, "'usucapio' or long usage").

C. J. Fordyce has justly pointed out in his review that many of the references "are of no use to the reader who has not Marx, Cichorius, and the classical journals at his elbow." But it is too much to expect that an edition of this scope should replace the larger work of Marx, however desirable that might be, considering how expensive, not to say almost unavailable, the latter is. One cannot

³ *C. J.*, XXXVI (1940), pp. 559-63.

⁴ *Phil. Wochenschr.*, LIX (1939), pp. 1048-51. If other reviews have appeared, I have not seen them.

gainsay Warmington's right to replace Marx's order of the fragments with one for whose greater reasonableness he argues convincingly, but it is regrettable that he did not adopt Marx's method of listing all the fragments as lines, whether or not they yield a recognizable verse or part-verse. Thus Marx's fragment 1149 is Warmington's "after 1110," or it might be referred to as "Warmington, page 360, *init.*" The awkwardness of referring to these fragments, of which there are thirty, makes Warmington's edition less convenient for general reference. But Warmington's numerous references to work which has appeared since the edition of Marx make it indispensable to the student of Lucilius, and we should be grateful for a work so abounding in helps and suggestions for the understanding of the Lucilian fragments, the more so inasmuch as the preparation of such an edition as this is a somewhat thankless task, considering the industry it requires and the impossibility of achieving anything like finality where so much is conjectural. The inclusion of the fragments of the *Twelve Tables* in this volume is strange, but justifiable, one must suppose, as a matter of typographical convenience to the *Loeb Classical Library*.

E. BOUCHER STEVENS.

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all are listed under BOOKS RECEIVED. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Berytus. Archeological Studies published by the Museum of Archeology of the American University of Beirut. Vol. VIII, Fasc. 1 (1943). New York, *Near East College Association* (50 West 50th Street). Pp. 72 + 8 pls.

Bibliographic Guide to English Studies. Compiled by Tom Peete Cross. Chicago, *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 1943. Pp. x + 74. \$1.00. (Eighth ed., revised, with an index.)

Düring (Ingemar). Aristotle's *De Partibus Animalium*: Critical and Literary Commentaries. Göteborg, *Elanders Boktryckeri Aktiebolag*, 1943. Pp. 223. Kr. 10. (*Göteborgs Kungl. Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhälles Handlingar*, Sjätte Följden, Ser. A, Band 2, N:o 1.)

Henry (Sister Rose De Lima). The Late Greek Optative and its Use in the Writings of Gregory Nazianzen. Washington, *The Catholic Univ. of America Press*, 1943. Pp. xix + 108. (*Patristic Studies*, LXVIII.)

Kennedy (Charles W.). The Earliest English Poetry: A Critical Survey of the Poetry Written before the Norman Conquest, with Illustrative Translations. London, New York, Toronto, *Oxford Univ. Press*, 1943. Pp. viii + 375. \$3.00.

Markman (Sidney David). The Horse in Greek Art. Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1943. Pp. xvii + 211; 62 figs. \$5.00. (*The Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies in Archaeology*, No. 35.)

Marsh (Frank Burr). Modern Problems in the Ancient World. Austin, *Univ. of Texas Press*, 1943. Pp. 123. \$1.00.

Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies, Vol. I, no. 2. London, *The Warburg Institute*, 1943. Pp. 151-334.

Tragedies (The) of Shakespeare, complete and unabridged. Modern Library Edition. New York, *Random House*, 1943. Pp. 1266. \$0.95.

Weiant (C. W.). An Introduction to the Ceramics of Tres Zapotes, Veracruz, Mexico. Washington, *U. S. Gov't. Printing Office*, 1943. Pp. xiv + 144; 78 pls. (*Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology*, Bulletin 139.)